HISTORY

OF

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

FOR USE IN SEMINARIES AND COLLEGES.

By DR. HEINRICH BRUECK,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL SEMINARY OF MENTZ.

With Additions from the Writings

OF

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL HERGENRÖTHER.

TRANSLATED

By REV. E. PRUENTE.

With an Introduction

By RIGHT REV. MGR. JAMES A. CORCORAN, S.T.D.,

PROFESSOR OF SACRED SCRIPTURE, MORAL THEOLOGY, ETC., ETC.

VOL. II.

THIRD, REVISED, EDITION.

OF THE

New York, Cincinnati, Chicago,

BENZIGER BROTHERS,

PRINTERS TO THE HOLY APOSTOLIC SEE.

Digitized by Google

LOAN STACK

Imprimatur,

✠ PETRUS RICARDUS KENRICK,

Archiep. S. Lud.

S. LUDOVICI, die 5 Julii, A. D. 1884.

Copyright, 1885,
BY BENZIGER BROTHERS.

Digitized by Google

BR145
B74
1884
v. 2

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

Second Epoch. — *Continued.*

PERIOD II.

FROM GREGORY VII. TO THE SO-CALLED REFORMATION.

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

2. From the Death of Boniface VIII. to the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century.

PAGE

§ 124. The Exile of the Popes at Avignon. — Popes Benedict XI. to Gregory XI., and the Relations they bore to the several States of Europe 12
125. The Western Schism 24
126. The Council of Pisa 28
127. The Council of Constance 29
128. The Popes Martin V. and Eugene IV., and the Councils of Siena and Basle 33
129. The last Popes of this Epoch. — Nicholas V. to Leo X. 40

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

1. Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.

130. The Primacy 47
131. The other Members of the Hierarchy 54

388

Digitized by Google

2. Religious Orders.

		PAGE
§ 132.	Religious Orders of Knights (Military Orders)	56
133.	The New Monastic Orders founded on the Rule of St. Benedict and St. Augustine	60
134.	The Orders devoted to the Special Veneration of Mary	62
135.	Orders founded expressly for taking Care of the Sick, and for other Objects of Charity	63
136.	The two great Mendicant Orders	65
137.	Efficiency of these Orders. — The Enmity they excited. — Disputes and Party-Divisions among themselves	67

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. The Achievements of Learning during this Epoch.

138.	The Universities. — Scholasticism and Mysticism	73
139.	The first Times of Scholasticism	76
140.	Flourishing Period of Scholasticism	79
141.	The Mystics	84
142.	The Scholastics and Mystics towards the End of the Middle Ages. — The several Branches of Learning	85
143.	Studies of the Humanists	89

2. Heresies and Schisms.

144.	Attempts to unite the Schismatic Greeks. — The Smaller Sects of the East	93
145.	The Smaller Sects of the West	98
146.	The Cathari (Albigenses and Waldenses)	99
147.	Ecclesiastical and Spanish Inquisition	103
148.	John Wycliffe and his Heresy	107
149.	The Heresy of John Huss	111

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

150.	The Holy Eucharist. — Penance	119
151.	Churches and their Ornamentation. — Religious Art	121
152.	Church Hymns and Canticles. — Veneration of Saints	124
153.	Various Forms of Superstition	126
154.	Christian Instruction	127
155.	Moral and Religious Life	129
156.	Retrospect concerning the Influence exercised by the Church in the Middle Ages	133

Digitized by Google

Third Epoch.

PERIOD I.

FROM THE SO-CALLED REFORMATION TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

A. EXTERIOR HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

		PAGE
§ 157.	Missions in India, Cochin China, Tonquin, Siam, Thibet, etc.	135
158.	Christianity in China and Japan, and in Africa	137
159.	Christian Missions in America	141

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

160.	Outbreak of the Schism in Germany. — Stand taken by Luther against Indulgences. — Measures taken by the Apostolic See	153
161.	Disputation at Leipsic and its Results	157
162.	The Diet of Worms. — Luther's Sojourn on the Wartburg. — The Prophets of Zwickau. — Luther's Contest with them	159
163.	Popes Adrian VI. and Clement VII. — The two Diets at Nuremberg	161
164.	The Peasants' War	162
165.	Introduction of the Lutheran Heresy by several Princes of the Empire. — Luther's Organization of Divine Service. — His Contest with Erasmus	163
166.	The Treaty of Torgau. — The two Diets at Spire, in 1526 and 1529	165
167.	The Diet at Augsburg, 1530. — "Confessio Augustana." — Colloquies	166
168.	The League of Schmalkald	168
169.	Further Progress of Protestantism. — Attempts at Reunion. — Bigamy of Philip of Hesse. — Acts of Violence. — Diets at Spire, 1542, 1544, and at Ratisbon, 1546. — Luther's Death. — His Character	169
170.	The Schmalkaldic War. — Treaty of Passau. — Peace of Augsburg	174
171.	The Reformation (so-called) in Switzerland. — Ulrich Zwingli	176
172.	The so-called Reformation in French Switzerland. — John Calvin	178
173.	Protestantism in France	182
174.	Protestantism in France (continued). — The Night of St. Bartholomew. — The League. — The Edict of Nantes. — Its Repeal under Louis XIV.	187
175.	Protestantism in the Netherlands	192
176.	Apostasy of England from the Church	194
177.	The so-called Reformation in Scotland	201

Digitized by Google

PAGE

§ 178. The Catholic Church in Great Britain under the Stuarts 203
179. The Sufferings of the Catholics in Ireland 207
180. Apostasy in Scandinavia 213
181. Protestantism in Livonia, Courland, Poland, and Silesia 215
182. Protestantism in Hungary and Transylvania 217
183. Relation between the Catholics and Protestants in Germany. — The Thirty Years' War. — The Peace of Westphalia 219
184. General Remarks on the Propagation, Nature, and Effects of the Reformation 223

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

185. The Council of Trent 226
186. Carrying into Effect the Reformatory Decrees of the Council of Trent 231
187. The Jesuits and the Order of Capuchins 234
188. Other Orders and Congregations of this Era 237
189. Exertions of, and Enmity towards, the Holy See 240
190. The so-called Gallican Liberties 245
191. The Popes of the Eighteenth Century. — Febronius 247
192. Josephism 251
193. Contest concerning the Nunciature. — The Congress of Ems . . 253
194. Italy. — The Synod of Pistoja 254

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. Ecclesiastical Learning.

195. The Theological Studies of this Period 256

2. Heresies and Schisms.

196. The Errors of the so-called Reformers 260
197. Contentions among the Protestants 264
198. The Smaller Protestant Sects 269
199. Controversies on the Relation which Grace bears to Free-Will . . 276
200. Jansenism 278
201. Jansenism (continued). — Quesnel 281
202. The Schism of Utrecht 283
203. Quietism 284
204. The Religious Condition of Germany after the Peace of Westphalia. — Several Attempts at Union 285
205. The Græco-Russian Church. — Attempts at Union. — The Older Sects of the East 289

Digitized by Google

PAGE

§ 206. Attacks upon Christianity. — English Deists. — Freemasons. — Philosophers in France 291
207. Protestant Rationalism 297
208. Rationalism in Catholic Circles 300
209. Hostility to the Jesuits and Suppression of their Order 303

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

210. The Celebration of Divine Worship. — Christian Art. — Religious Life 307

PERIOD II.

FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION DOWN TO OUR OWN DAY.

A. EXTERIOR HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

PAGE

§ 211. Missions in the East Indies, China, Japan, etc. 310
212. The Catholic Church in the United States 312
213. Missions in Central America, the West Indies, and South America, in Africa and Oceanica 328
214. Missions in Turkey and Persia 331

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

215. Influence of the French Revolution on Ecclesiastical Affairs . . . 334
216. Restoration of Ecclesiastical Order in France. — Concordat of 1801. — Napoleon and Pope Pius VII. 338
217. The Catholic Church in Germany. — Secularization 342
218. The Catholic Church in Bavaria under Maximilian Joseph I. and Louis I. 345
219. Ecclesiastical Affairs in Prussia. — Troubles in Cologne 347
220. The Ecclesiastical Provinces of the Upper Rhine 350
221. The Condition of Ecclesiastical Affairs in Austria under Francis II. and Ferdinand I. 353
222. The Catholic Church in the States of the German Alliance since the Year 1848 356
223. The Restoration. — France under the Bourbons. — Louis Philippe. — Emperor Napoleon III. — The Republic 365
224. The Catholic Church in Spain and Portugal 370
225. The Catholic Church in the Italian States 374

Digitized by Google

PAGE
§ 226. Ecclesiastical Affairs in Switzerland 376
227. The Condition of the Catholic Church in the Netherlands . . . 380
228. Persecutions of the Catholic Church in Poland and Russia . . . 384
229. Catholicity in Ireland 388
230. Revival of Catholicity in England and Scotland. — Restoration of the Hierarchy in both Countries 393

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

PAGE
231. The Popes of the Nineteenth Century 400
232. The Œcumenical Council of the Vatican 405

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. Scientific Studies.

233. Theological Science in the Nineteenth Century 407

2. Heresies and Schisms.

234. Theological Tendencies among Protestants 412
235. The Protestant Union and its Results. — Several Shades in Protestantism 415
236. Interior State of Protestantism — Sects 418
237. The Sect of the Rongeans and of the so-called Old Catholics . . 423
238. The Schismatic Churches of the East 425

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

239. Divine Service. — Christian Life 426
240. Concluding Remarks 430

Chronological List of Popes from Benedict XI. to Leo XIII. 432
Chronological List of Œcumenical Councils from the Council of Vienne to that of the Vatican 433
Chronological Table of Popes, Emperors, Kings, and Important Events, from Benedict XI. to the dissolution of the German Empire in 1806. . 434

Index 455

Digitized by Google

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Second Epoch.

PERIOD II.

FROM GREGORY VII. TO THE SO-CALLED REFORMATION.

A. HISTORY OF THE EXTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

2. From the Death of Boniface VIII. to the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century.

Introductory Remarks.

THE era from the pontificate of Boniface VIII. forms the transition period to that of modern times. It shows us, first, *the decrease of papal power.* Imperialism had been weakened in its authority and influence by the contests in which it had been involved through the fault of those who wore the imperial crown, and those contests had also so injured the papacy as to compel it to have recourse to France. France, in virtue of its ancient and intimate relations to the Holy See, arrogated to itself claims far too high. It was the dependence of the Popes on French policy that had induced them to transfer their residence to Avignon; and the endeavor, on the one hand, of the Popes to free themselves from this yoke by returning to Rome, and on the other the efforts made by France to secure the advantages it had gained, led to the forty years' schism. Naturally, these circumstances weakened the influence and authority of the Holy See; they engendered in the very bosom of the Church itself a many-sided opposition, which called into existence new doctrines respecting the nature of the ecclesiastical constitution, and new reformatory experiments, which, not being guided

Digitized by Google

by clear views as to their tendency, not being founded on any solid basis, but being simply the result of the excitement under which the spirits of the age acted, were far more successful in tearing down than in building up. Nor at that period did so many able and noble minds succeed each other in St. Peter's seat, as had in the past ages ruled the storm. Not every one of the Popes was able to take a right view of his position under the ever-varying relationships by which he was surrounded. Not all of them were able to cope with the exigencies of the age; some few of them were not worthy of the high dignity to which they were called. The ecclesiastical opposition took advantage of their short-comings, even as the politico-democratic party ever availed themselves of the weak side of monarchy. Reverence for authority, and with it that willing obedience which springs from such reverence, was vanishing more and more; as the bishops wished to coerce the Pope, the priests also wished to coerce the bishops, and the laity to coerce the clergy. The weakening of the Church in its centre led to the weakening of every part of her periphery.

Secondly, this period shows *the rise of a self-conscious temporal State policy hostile to the Church;* entailing an excessive increase of State encroachments on the domain of the Church. Kings withdrew themselves more and more from the guidance of the ecclesiastical law. The State, instead of recognizing the supreme authority of the Church, strove more and more to subordinate spiritual authority to the temporal, to sever political relationships from the domain of religion and morality. As a consequence, the sentiment of unity and of family alliance among Christian nations gave way more and more to national jealousy and egotism. The Pope being no longer arbiter between princes, the sword alone could decide their disputes. Such a change of spirit could not fail to bring with it new and grave dangers even to the temporal power.

Therefore this age shows, thirdly, *the presumptuous insolence* which, as the bonds of authority became loosened, seized on the unfettered spirit. It shows, also, the strong tendency to revolution which everywhere appears when the higher sustaining powers are arrested in the performance of their duty, and not able to correspond to the most urgent demands of the soul; then the spirit of unity gives way to the egoistic selfishness of individuals, and, in the place of the high ideal, the rude craving after material gain, the selfish desire of individual advantage, predominates. Therefore it was that a gross materialism, promoted by new inventions and new dis-

Digitized by Google

coveries, set in; this was fostered, also, by the more common extension of classical studies, combined with a reawakening of a pagan spirit, which aspired only at realizing earthly treasures and temporal enjoyments, forgetting heaven in its attachment to the world.

To this was united, fourthly, on the one hand, *a degeneracy of science,* as of theology and jurisprudence; and on the other, *a wider expansion of some scientific branches,* as in historical criticism, in linguistic studies, and in empiricism. The representatives of the newly cultivated fields of material science lost sight of tradition and authority, and attached themselves in great measure to the new heretics, many of whom used religion only as a pretext for political innovations.

Fifthly, *heresy* at this period bears *a much more general character* than it formerly did, — embraces a much wider scope. Up to that time the Church had found no adequate opponent in the sects that had arisen; now new ones came forth, who assailed her not merely in her separate dogmas but in her very roots, availing themselves of real or pretended abuses in clerical life to justify their negation, and using the cry that had become the watchword, "Reformation of the Church in her Head and members," to foster discontent and to deceive the masses. Thus by degrees everything became uncertain, — everything became a doubt, a question. Individualism pressed itself forward: revolt and warfare followed. The false systems organized with the view of limiting the *power* alike of the spiritual and of the temporal order, with the view of contenting the spiritual and bodily requirements of the age, sought to find realization in actual life. Some sparks were emitted, from which was soon to arise a brightly glowing flame.

Yet amid storms such as these, amid the veriest perversities of schism, the apostolic seat of St. Peter still maintained its ground. Fiercely shaken it was, but never destroyed, being upheld by the divine protection. Even the temporary predominance of a false ecclesiastical constitutionalism, even the councils that were held in opposition to it, could not undermine its authority, although such means partially succeeded in obscuring it in the eyes of many contemporaries and of some of those who came after. Even those who were unworthy to wear the tiara have in several instances done much for the promotion of knowledge, for the furtherance of missions, and for the maintenance of ecclesiastical order and discipline. Also, throughout this period there never failed a time in which great saints, doctors, and princes did not appear, nor any in which religious

Digitized by Google

enthusiasm did not give birth to noble deeds This enthusiasm displayed itself in the most brilliant manner in Spain, when it came out victorious from its contests with the Moors, and was united into a mighty kingdom which formed the first great power.

Islam, succumbing in the west, yet making mighty strides in the southeast of Europe, owing to the disunion among Christian princes, called forth the energy of some distinguished men, and to some extent obviated the torpidity, the intellectual and moral laxity, to which otherwise Hungary, Poland, and Germany would have been entirely sacrificed.

The mighty tide-wave which had seized upon the nations, while it promoted much that was bad, also brought to light much that was good. It served to the further spreading of the kingdom of Christ, which in the remotest east, south, and west was to find compensation for the losses it had sustained in the north.

Good elements existed yet, struggling with the bad, — elements fraught with desire for the welfare of the Church and endowed with zeal and strength. But it was through these mighty storms that the air of the Church was to be purified; it was through these hard contests that a new victory was to be gained. The renovation of the Church was to take place from *within*, after the whole edifice had been shaken from without to its very centre, to its very base.

§ 124. *The Exile of the Popes at Avignon. — Popes Benedict XI. to Gregory XI., and the Relations they bore to the several States of Europe.*

Ten days after the death of Boniface VIII., Benedict XI.[1] was unanimously elected at Rome (Oct. 22, 1303). He sought to restore peace with the French court without violating justice.

By the advice of Nogaret, Philip IV. had sent an embassy to Rome. The Pope received the members of it kindly, and without being again requested, removed the censures which had been passed upon the king. Subsequently he issued several decrees by which the punishments which had been inflicted by Boniface on France were revoked, and several far from insignificant favors were granted

[1] Nicholas Boccasini, General of the Dominicans, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. He was properly the tenth of the name, since Benedict X. was an anti-Pope (see § 90). Concerning Benedict XI. and the following Popes, see *Christophe*, Hist. of the Papacy in the Fourteenth Century. *Hefele*, Hist of the Councils, vi. 344 sqq. *Baluze*, Vitae pap. Avenion., tom. ii., Paris.

Digitized by Google

to the king.[1] Benedict also partly withdrew the penalties imposed on the Colonnas,[2] and he absolved from excommunication all the Frenchmen who were implicated in the outrage at Anagni, with the exception of Nogaret; but Philip IV. was by no means satisfied with these concessions. He demanded of Benedict the convocation of a general council to pass judgment on Pope Boniface VIII., whom he accused of heresy; his object being to gratify his hate and to justify his own conduct before Christendom.

Benedict evaded a definite answer, and put off his decision to a later day. But he died at Perugia, after a brief pontificate of eight months, and after having expressed in no measured terms his abhorrence of the outrage committed at Anagni.[3] His death was not without suspicion of poison.

A division in the college of cardinals as to the position which the future Pope should hold relatively to France delayed the papal election, so that it was the 5th of June, 1305, in the eleventh month of the conclave, before Bertrand de Got (Clement V., 1305–1314) was proclaimed supreme head of the Church.

The rumor that this Pope had made six concessions to the King of France before his election is false, though it is patent that his connivance with the French court after he became Pope gave countenance to the report.

This Pope withdrew the bull "Clericis laicos," and made the declaration that the operation of the bull "Unam sanctam" should not prejudice France.[4] He restored the Colonnas to their honors and dignities, gave an unheard-of preference to the French in his promotions to the cardinalate, as well as in the decree which granted to the avarice of the king the tithes of the Church for five years. He raised the candidates nominated by the king to the most influential episcopal sees of France, suppressing or ignoring by that act the right of election inherent in the cathedral chapter; and even then Philip was not satisfied. He had not lost sight of Nogaret's design, and demanded of Clement, immediately after his coronation, that he should commence a process against Boniface, whom he charged with heresy.

Philip had yet another object in view; namely, the suppression

[1] *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vi. 345 sqq.

[2] *Hefele*, Hist of the Councils, vi. 345, n. 2.

[3] Bull "Flagitiosum scelus." *Tosti*, ii. 313, 14.

[4] C. 2 Meruit V. 7 Extravag. comm. de privileg. Cf. *Bianchi* della Podestà, etc., I. § 10, p. 98 sqq. *Phillips*, Ec. Rec. iii. 266.

Digitized by Google

of the Order of Knights Templars, to effect which he desired the co-operation of the Pope.

Clement hesitated to comply with the demands of the king, who in May, 1307, and subsequently reiterated his propositions respecting the heresy of Boniface, and was most urgent in his endeavors to induce the Pope to comply with his wishes respecting the Order of the Templars. The Pope yielded at length to the second point, and even expressed his willingness to hear the accusers of his illustrious predecessor, of whose innocence he declared his personal conviction.

The judicial examination took place on the 16th of March, 1310, in a consistory at Avignon, at which place Clement had resided since 1309. The envoys of the King of France were Nogaret, who was still under excommunication,[1] William du Plessis, and others, who brought forward against Boniface VIII. the most improbable calumnies, invented by hatred, and which had been circulated for years by the accomplices of Philip. Finally, the king, whose principal aim at that time was directed towards the Knights Templars, was fain to content himself with the understanding that the process against Boniface should be decided at Vienne, at

The Fifteenth Œcumenical Council (Oct. 16, 1311, to May 6, 1312),

which had already been convoked by the Pope. At this synod the charges against Boniface were declared to be unfounded, and thus the design of the King of France was frustrated.

But with regard to the Order of the Templars,[2] the suppression of which was determined upon at Vienne, the king did attain his object, which was to fill his own coffers with the confiscated treasures belonging to the Templars, at the same time that he won for himself the reputation of being a defender of orthodoxy.

Although Clement V. had acceded to the greater number of wishes expressed by the King of France, he did not countenance his plan of obtaining the royal crown of Germany and that of the empire for his brother Charles of Valois. Pope Clement favored the election

[1] He was absolved on April 27, 1311. The bull "Licet" in *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1311, n. 50, contains the conditions.

[2] See § 132. At the Council of Vienne the proposition (which Günther has in modern times renewed) that the "anima rationalis sive intellectiva" is not "vere forma corporis" is rejected as erroneous.

Digitized by Google

of Henry, Count of Luxemburg, who, in 1310, set out on his journey to Rome.

Filled with the idea of imperial omnipotence, Henry VII. made his appearance in Italy, which had been fearfully devastated by the continual conflicts between the Ghibellines and the Guelphs, and was crowned emperor in the Lateran by the cardinals commissioned to perform that office. Unable to keep aloof from the strife of party, he found himself drawn in to take sides where he could not establish a peace. He joined the Ghibellines, who had welcomed him by acclamation, and he then became their leader. The Guelphs, on the other hand, found an ally in Robert, King of Naples; and it was against this latter that Henry's anger was directed.

It was in vain that the Pope endeavored to induce the princes to agree to an armistice. Henry went on with his warlike preparations, and threatened Naples, declared Robert an enemy of the empire, and, April 26, 1313, placed him under the ban of the empire, and pronounced sentence of death upon him for high-treason. Being called upon by France and England to annul this sentence, Clement required the emperor to revoke his hasty judgment. Henry did not comply; and everything was already prepared to attack Naples, which was a fief of the Roman Church, when Henry died, at Pisa, on the 24th of August, 1313, after a short sickness.

In England, during the reign of Edward I. (1272–1307), the king, who was continually at war with France and Scotland, encroached in many ways upon the ancient rights of the Church. But this was far less the case under Edward II. (1307–1327). When the king, in 1312, was threatened by a turbulent nobility, Clement V. sent two legates to mediate between him and his barons; and after a protracted stubbornness of purpose on the part of the latter, they finally effected a peace between them. The bishops remained personally attached to the king, but they resisted the efforts made by temporal judges to cite cases appertaining to ecclesiastical discipline before their forum.[1]

There had been many claimants to the throne of Scotland; and Edward I. of England had at first declared in favor of John Baliol, who paid him feudal homage; but afterwards Edward made war against him and took him prisoner on the plea that he was an

[1] This attempt was also made under Edward III.; but he finally acknowledged the authority of the ecclesiastical courts over clerics. The bishops were also frequently compelled to defend the rights of the Church to her own possessions and to the making of ecclesiastical appointments.

Digitized by Google

unfaithful vassal. The Scots elected young Robert Bruce as king; and he drove the troops of the English king, Edward II., out of the kingdom of Scotland, and maintained his own independence in it until his death, in 1328. He refused to receive the legates of John XXII., because the papal letter which they brought in reference to his disputed right to the throne and to the claims of England denied him the title of king. When afterwards, for the sake of peace, the Pope gave him that title, his Holiness declared that he did so without prejudice to any advantage or disadvantage that might accrue to either side.[1]

In the year 1314 Pope Clement V. departed this life, on the 20th of April. But it was not before the 7th of August, 1316, that he found a successor[2] in James of Ossa, from Cahors, Cardinal Bishop of Porto, who took the name of John XXII.

The first care of this Pope was directed to Germany. Here, on the 25th of November, 1314, during the vacancy of the apostolic chair, a double election had taken place. Frederic of Austria and Louis of Bavaria were contending for the royal crown. Both appealed to the Pope for recognition and for coronation as emperor. John XXII. called upon them (Sept. 5, 1316) to come to a peaceable understanding, and at first recognized neither of the elected princes as king, but confirmed King Robert of Naples in the position he had received from his predecessor as Imperial Vicar of Italy for such time as the imperial throne should remain vacant.[3]

The victory of Mühldorf (Sept. 28, 1322) gave Louis the upper hand in Germany; and he immediately assumed the state due to a king, nay, even that belonging to an emperor,[4] while he now

[1] This declaration was in conformity with one of Clement V., and similar to those made by other Popes on like occasions. The Popes did not interfere in the contest for the throne by both countries; they only sought to uphold the rights of the Church in like manner as Eugene IV., for instance, upheld them against James, King of Scotland.

[2] One part of the cardinals wished for a Pope who would again take up his residence in Rome; but those who were attached to France resisted this. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vi. 505 sqq.

[3] "Imperium vacans" as distinguished from "regnum vacans."

[4] Thereby coming into contradiction with himself and with the convictions of his contemporaries. Cf. *Mutii*, Chron. Germ. xxiv. 866: "Tanta Romanae sedis auctoritas et religio erat apud plerosque, ut non judicarent nec appellandum censerent imperatorem, nisi prius unctus, coronatus, confirmatusque esset." (*Pistor*. Germ. Script. ii. 866.) *Gerh. de Roo*, Hist. Austriac. ii. 88: "Ea Pontificis auctoritas, ea apud plerosque reverentia erat, uti ab ejus confirmatione imperatoria dignitas penderet multique per

Digitized by Google

demanded recognition from the Pope without further examination into his claims. At the same time he gave offence by the support he rendered to Galeazzo Visconti in Milan, and to other enemies of the Church, besides attacking the imperial vicar. In this manner he came into collision with the Holy See; and in October, 1323, John XXII. required him within three months to resign the administration of the empire and withdraw his operations from Italy until such time as the papal decision was given, and this under pain of excommunication.

The king, whose behavior during this conflict had been a mixture of undignified weakness and of ill-tempered spite, asked for a protraction of the limited time assigned, while at the same time he protested, at the Diet of Nuremberg, against the papal demand, which he characterized as unjustifiable, and demanded an œcumenical council against John XXII., who, he said, favored the heretics.

The sentence of excommunication which was pronounced on him in March, 1324, was answered by Louis in a manifesto on the 22d of May, wherein John was charged with heresy and with encroaching on the rights of the electoral princes. The Pope denied both these charges, denouncing them as calumnies, and then pronounced (July, 1324) still severer censures on Louis, who had oftentimes violated the rights of the Church.[1]

The position taken by Leopold of Austria, Frederic's brother, who in agreement with the Pope wished to help King Charles IV. of France to the imperial crown, compelled Louis to conclude the Treaty of Ulm with Frederic (Jan. 7, 1326). According to this, Frederic was to rule over Germany, while Louis was to govern Italy and to wear the imperial crown; but the stipulations of this treaty were never carried out. Leopold died on the 28th of February, and Louis became sole ruler.

The excommunicated king, under the influence of false advisers,—especially of the schismatic Minorites, the so-called Fratricelli,[2]—was induced by them still further to increase his opposition to the

Germaniam neutrum ex regibus agnoscere vellent, quoad de Pontificis voluntate constaret."

[1] *Martene*, l. c. p. 652 sqq. To the reproach that the Pope was encroaching on the rights of the electors, John replied: "Nequaquam nostrae intentionis extitit, nec existit, juri principum ecclesiasticorum vel saecularium, ad quos electio Romani regis in futurum imperatorem promovendi spectare noscitur, per processus nostros, seu aliqua contenta in eis, in aliquo derogare immo illud omnino eis illibatum volumus reservari" (p. 671).

[2] See § 137.

Digitized by Google

Church, against which he waged war, partly by sheer violence, partly by the pen.

Among the anti-papal writings thus elicited, opposition is carried to its height in the "Defensor pacis" of Marsilius of Padua, aided by his colleague in the Parisian High School, John of Jandun, and the spiritualist Ubertino of Casale, both doctors at Paris. These authors not only subordinate the spiritual power to that of the temporal, but they overturn the whole constitution of the Church, and promulgate principles concerning ecclesiastical authority which at a later date were enunciated by Calvin; they also bring forward the basest and coarsest defamations of the papacy.[1]

The schismatic Minorites Michael of Cesena, Bonagratia, and particularly William of Occam,[2] took part in these polemics of the pen. The last-named reiterated in his various writings chiefly the erroneous views developed by Dante in his "Monarchia," but went even further, and wandered so wide from the truth that he came to deny the infallibility of the Pope and of the general councils, and ascribed the final right of decision to the whole association of Christians.

As opponents to these false and pernicious principles, the Dominican Petrus de Palude, the Minorite Alvarus Pelagius (+ 1352), and the Augustinian hermit Augustinus Triumphus (+ 1328) came forward. Their writings, however, are not free from untenable doctrines in many points, especially in reference to the papal power and to its relation to the temporal.

Misled by his schismatic surroundings, the blinded king proceeded, in 1327, on his expedition to Italy. In Milan he received the iron crown, and then with solemn ceremony made his entrance into Rome On Jan. 17, 1328, he was crowned emperor by Sciarra

[1] In the bull "Licet juxta doctrinam" (*Martene*, ii. 704 sqq.), John condemned the defender, and censured the following propositions: "Quod res ecclesiae temporales sunt imperatori subjectae et eas possit recipere velut suas. Quod b. Petrus apost. non plus auctoritatis habuit, quam alii apostoli habuerint, nec aliorum apostolorum sit caput. Item quod Christus nullum caput dimisit ecclesiae, nec aliquem vicarium suum fecit. Quod ad imperatorem spectat, papam instituere et destituere ac punire. Quod omnes sacerdotes sive sit papa, sive archiepiscopus, sive sacerdos simplex, sunt ex institutione Christi auctoritatis et jurisdictionis aequales : quod autem unus plus alio habeat, hoc est secundum quod imperator concedit uni vel alii plus et minus, et sicut concessit alicui sic potest etiam illud revocare. Quod tota ecclesia simul juncta nullum hominem punire potest punitione coactiva, nisi concedat hoc imperator." Cf. *Bianchi*, Della potestà e della politia della chiesa, ii. 565.

[2] See § 142.

Digitized by Google

Colonna, in the name of the Roman people. On the 18th of April Louis declared the Pope guilty of heresy and of other crimes, deposed him from his dignity, and had him burnt in effigy. Some weeks after this, he nominated the ill-famed Minorite Peter Rainalducci from Corvara, under the name of Nicholas V., as supreme head of the Church. This anti-Pope repeated the coronation of Louis as emperor.

On receiving intelligence of what had transpired in Rome, John XXII. had a crusade preached against the excommunicated king, and summoned the German princes to a new election.

The triumph of the last imperial anti-Pope was of short duration. The king, on the 4th of August, 1328, was obliged to leave Rome, covered with shame and hooted out by the scorn of the people. He returned to Germany, while the anti-Pope, after some wanderings, submitted to the rightful Pope. To elevate and strengthen his authority, which had fallen to a somewhat low level, Louis, in May, 1330, entered into negotiations with the Holy See without giving any secure sign of having changed his sentiments, on which account John XXII. could not accede to his proposals. At length, in 1333, the king declared himself ready to resign in favor of his cousin, Henry of Lower Bavaria; but at this juncture the intrigues of the kings of Hungary and Naples frustrated the restoration of peace.

During the time that this obnoxious conflict had been carried on, the Pope had strictly adhered to the rule of right principles, while Louis had vacillated from one side to the other, and the princes of the empire, regardless of all principle, had sold their fidelity and their votes for money.

To ruin the authority of the Pope, Louis, whose peaceful inclinations were again changed into a vehement opposition, made the attempt, by the advice of his counsellors, to have John XXII. arraigned as a heretic before a general council, on account of his "Visio beata,"[1] and deposed. The death of the Pope hindered the carrying out of this strangely conceived plan.

[1] In a sermon John thus expressed himself concerning the view of the blest: "Merces sanctorum ante Christi adventum erat sinus Abrahae. Post adventum vero Christi et ejus passionem et ascensionem in coelo merces sanctorum est et erit usque ad diem judicii, esse *sub* altari Dei, quia animae justorum usque ad diem judicii erunt sub altari, i.e. *sub protectione et consolatione humanitatis Christi.* Sed postquam Christus venerit ad judicium erunt *super* altare, i.e. super Christi humanitate, quia post diem judicii videbunt . . . non solum humanitatem Christi sed etiam *divinitatem*, ut in se est. Videbunt etiam patrem et filium per spiritum sanctum." (*Baluze*,

Digitized by Google

John XXII. died Dec. 4, 1334. He was a learned, ascetic, educated man, and an indefatigably active Pope, who made great sacrifices for the promotion of learning, regulated the course of business in the curia for the papal chancery and the Rota Romana, and frequently preached the truths of Christianity to the people. One of the principal objects of his solicitude was the liberation of the Holy Land, for which purpose he, by great economy and by a manifold taxation of the Church,[1] had collected large sums.

John XXII. was succeeded by the mild and placable Benedict XII. (1334–1342), who immediately took the necessary steps for the reformation of the curia, and bethought him, in all earnestness, of carrying the resolves of his predecessor into execution by returning to Rome.[2] But this was to be his lot as little as the carrying out of that other project of reconciling Louis with the Church. The Pope himself took the initiative in the matter, but was not able to withstand the French oppression; therefore the envoys of the king, equally with the emissaries of the bishops, who were assembled at Spire in 1338, had to leave Avignon without coming to any conclusion.

Under such circumstances, any settlement of the conflict was out of the question, and the exasperation against France increased daily. In July of the same year, the electors came together in the Diet of Rhense, and declared that the one who should be elected by the majority was the lawful king. This view was also maintained in many writings, the authors of which identified the empire with the heathenish Roman Imperium, or made it dependent on the German kingdom, leaving to the Pope only the right of coronation. They contested the oath taken by the emperor to the Pope,

Vitae pap. Aven. i. 788.) On the controversies arising from these expressions, see *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vi. 522 sqq.; *Christophe*, ii. 19 sqq. On his death-bed John declared: "Fatemur et credimus, quod animae purgatae et separatae a corporibus sunt in coelo, coelorum regno et paradiso et cum Christo in consortio angelorum congregatae et vident Deum ac divinam essentiam facie ad faciem clare, in quantum status et conditio compatitur animae separatae; si vero alia vel aliter circa materiam hujusmodi per nos dicta, praedicata, seu scripta fuerunt quoquo modo, illa diximus, praedicavimus seu scripsimus recitando dicta sacrae scripturae et sanctorum et conferendo et non *determinando nec etiam tenendo et sic et non aliter* illa volumus esse dicta, praedicata seu scripta." Benedict XII. gave a dogmatic decision in the bull "Benedictus Deus." Cf. *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1335, n. 8, sqq.

[1] Annates (first fruits), etc. See § 130.

[2] In a poetical epistle the celebrated poet Petrarch petitioned the Pope to take up his residence in Rome (Carm. lib. i. ep. 2).

Digitized by Google

as also the right of said Pope to appoint an imperial vicar when the throne was vacant.

Such were the views, even if more moderately expressed, of Lupold of Bebenburg, Bishop of Bamberg (+ 1363), and of the Abbot Engelbert of Admont. They stood, however, in too striking a contradiction to historical development to effect any sudden change in existing relationships, although they were not without influence on the views of a later period.

Meantime the excommunicated king protested, at the Diet of Frankfort, on August 6, against the sentence passed on him by John XXII., and issued a constitution in which he declared that the imperial dignity is derived immediately from God, and that the person elected by the electoral princes is to be considered king or emperor without requiring any confirmation from the Pope. Another edict forbade the reception of any papal bull or the like, without the consent of the archbishop; it also forbade that obedience should be paid to it. The few clergymen who observed the interdict were threatened with severe punishment.

The Church in Germany was in a most deplorable condition, especially from the fact that reverence for the Holy See was decreasing more and more.[1] The papal court at Avignon seems not to have rightly known or comprehended the misery of the Church in Germany; for the successor of Benedict XII., Clement VI. (1342–1352), — the great lover of pomp, who, by the purchase of Avignon and the nomination of French cardinals, had bound the papacy by still closer ties to France, — renewed, April 12, 1343, the censures against Louis, who, in November, 1342, had made overtures of peace to him. The Pope continued, however, to negotiate with the envoys of the king. Louis, who, by his oppressions of the Church, by his greed of increasing his dominions, and especially by his usurpation of clerical authority in the affair of divorce granted by him to Margaret (Maultasch), heiress of Tyrol and Carinthia, and in the dispensations from impediments to marriage by blood relationship which he took upon himself to legalize, had evoked a great opposition to his house in Germany, showed an inclination to accede to the papal conditions; but now the Pope, suspecting fraud, made greater demands on him than before. These demands were rejected at the Diet of Frankfort

[1] *Mutii*, Chron. Germ. xiv. p. 881. Of the sermons preached at this era it is said: "Aliquamdiu nihil aliud ad populum praedicabant [scl. the adherents of Louis], quam de imperatore et pontifice, probabant omnes declamantes ad populum, imperium esse immediate a Deo, nec habere papam quidquam juris in imperium," etc.

Digitized by Google

(Sept. 8, 1344), and at the second meeting of the electoral princes at Rhense (Sept. 16). At the last place the necessity of electing a new king was discussed.

On July 11, 1346, Prince Charles IV., son of John, King of Bohemia, was elected by five electoral princes at the recommendation of the Pope. The adherents of Louis, against whom Clement had published a very severe bull of excommunication on Holy Thursday, 1346, protested against this, and on the death of Louis (1347) set up as anti-king Günther of Schwarzburg, who, however, died soon after, on June 14, 1349. After this Charles was universally acknowledged; and at Easter, 1355, the king received in Rome the imperial crown, and in the same year regulated the election of the German king by the Golden bull, which makes the right to the German crown dependent on the majority of votes cast by the electoral princes. By this act, as also by his declaration that he would reform the German clergy by his own authority, the emperor fell into a transient discord with Pope Innocent VI. (1352–1362), who had succeeded Clement.

Being urgently invited thereto by the inhabitants of Rome, Innocent VI. adopted the project that had been entertained by his predecessors, of returning to Rome, the Eternal City, which during the absence of the Popes had been the prey of the wildest party-feuds. After the overthrow of the dominion of the nobles, the celebrated demagogue Cola di Rienzi, with the consent of the Pope, assumed the reins of government; but, having by his luxurious habits and ostentatious behavior incurred the hatred of the people, he was excommunicated by Cardinal Bertrand de Deux, Legate of Clement VI., and forced to flee the city. Driven from Rome (1347), Rienzi wandered from place to place, and was at last delivered into the power of the Pope by the Emperor Charles IV. Meantime other tyrants had seized hold of the government. To put an end to their rule, Pope Innocent sent, in 1353, the valiant Cardinal Ægidius Albornoz with an army to Italy. To him Rienzi was sent by the Pope, and named Senator of Rome; but when reintrusted with power, he became again intoxicated with vanity, acted like a tyrant, and was slain in a tumult of the people. In the year 1361 the papal dominion over Rome was again established; but his project of returning thither himself Innocent had to transfer to his successor Urban V. (1362–1370), a truly apostolic man.

Pope Urban V., weary at length of imprisonment at Avignon,[1]

[1] In 1366 Petrarch asked the Pope whether he wished one day to rise again with the sinners of Avignon or with the martyrs of Rome.

Digitized by Google

returned to Rome on the 19th of May, 1367, by way of Marseilles, in spite of the remonstrances of the French king, Charles V. In September, 1370, he left the unquiet city, ostensibly to endeavor to end the war that had again broken out between France and England; but, as St. Bridget of Sweden had foretold, he died soon after his arrival in France (Dec. 19, 1370).

After the death of Urban, Gregory XI. (1370–1378), a nephew of Clement VI., and the last French Pope, ascended the papal throne. He yielded to the request of Catherine of Siena, a nun of the Dominican order,[1] and in spite of the opposition of the cardinals, and the remonstrances of Charles V. of France, returned to Rome. He had hardly arrived there (Jan. 17, 1377), when he bethought him of again quitting Italy, which was then a prey to faction and torn to pieces by the spirit of party; but before he could carry out his purpose he died, on the 27th of March, 1378.

Shortly before his death, Gregory by a bull empowered the sixteen cardinals who had accompanied him to Rome to elect a new pontiff without waiting the arrival of the six cardinals who had remained in Avignon. He also decided that the election might take place anywhere, at any suitable place and without conclave, by a simple majority of votes.

The unanimous choice of the cardinals on the 8th of April fell on the Archbishop of Bari, Bartholomew Prignano (Urban VI.), a very able Pope; but he conducted himself so harshly towards the refractory cardinals that they soon broke with him entirely. The discontented ones, eleven of whom were Frenchmen, and Peter de Luna, a Spaniard, left Rome, and at Anagni declared the election of Urban invalid, and renounced obedience to him. With them three Italian cardinals, won over by promises, united. Only Cardinal Tebaldeschi remained faithful to the Pope. The rebellious cardinals, at Fondi, whither also their colleague, the Cardinal of Amiens, had repaired, elected Cardinal Robert of Geneva, Pope. He took the name of Clement VII., and took up his residence at Avignon. The three Italian cardinals took no part in the election, but neither did they protest against it.

In order to justify their desertion of Urban, the cardinals alleged that the whole transaction concerning the election of Urban had been uncanonical and

[1] *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1376, n. 1. She had written to the Pope on this subject, and during her presence at Avignon, as advocate for the Florentines, she exhorted him in person to return to Rome.

Digitized by Google

invalid on account of the pressure exercised by the electors. It is true, indeed, that the Romans had urgently requested the cardinals to choose a Roman or at least an Italian Pope, and had given a tumultuous expression to their desire for the election of a Roman Pope, before the Vatican, during the conclave. Other disturbances had followed after the election had taken place, because false ideas had been entertained respecting the person elected, as the cardinals for certain reasons did not immediately make known the result of the election. "But," says Cardinal Hergenröther, in his "Church History," "all these tumults were not of the kind to interfere with the freedom of election; in fact, in the afternoon twelve cardinals held a second election altogether free, when the choice again fell on the Archbishop of Bari. Order was soon restored; the election was solemnly proclaimed on April 9, and on the 10th the enthronization took place in the church of St. Peter, while on Easter Sunday (the 18th of April) the coronation was solemnized.

"The new Pope, Urban VI., received general recognition. All the cardinals there assembled attended at his coronation, assisted him at the ecclesiastical feasts, requested spiritual favors at his hands, and wrote an account of what had passed to their colleagues in Avignon with the assurance that perfect freedom and unanimity had prevailed. The six cardinals who had been left in Avignon also acknowledged him as Pope, and ordered the commandant of the castle of St. Angelo to deliver up the keys to him, as the former Pope had made this surrendering of the keys of that fortress dependent on their consent. Moreover, Urban's escutcheon was exposed at Avignon, and homage done to it." (Church History, vol. ii. p. 35.)

§ 125. *The Western Schism.*

The next consequence of the election of Robert of Geneva was a most lamentable schism[1] in Christendom. Most of the Catholic countries remained faithful to Urban VI., for whom Catherine of Siena was especially zealous; but his opponents found allies in Johanna, Queen of Naples, and Charles V., King of France, by whose efforts Lorraine and Scotland, and subsequently also Castile and Aragon, were drawn into the schism.

To facilitate the return of the schismatics to the Church, Urban, who previously to the election of the anti-Pope had nominated twenty-nine new cardinals, hesitated to publish the bull of excommunication; and it was not till the last hope of pacification had vanished that he excommunicated Robert and his abettors. To this the anti-Pope replied by anathematizing Urban.

The faithlessness of Queen Johanna of Naples induced Urban

[1] *Theod. a Niem*, De Schismate, lib. 4. Theodoric of Niem founded the German hospice "Anima" at Rome.

Digitized by Google

to take the kingdom from her, and invest Charles of Durazzo with it, as with a fief of the Holy See. Johanna sought help from the French court, and adopted Louis, Duke of Anjou, to whom the anti-Pope presented a portion of the States of the Church as the Kingdom of Adria. Urban had a crusade preached against Louis. Before this prince could arrive in Italy, Charles III., supported by the Pope, had already conquered Naples; and all the attempts of Louis (+1384) to regain the rule over the kingdom were frustrated less by the arms of his antagonist than through the famine and sickness which wasted his army.

Unfortunately, dissensions broke out between Urban, who had come to Naples, and his perfidious vassal, with whom some cardinals, exasperated by the harshness of the Pope, made common cause. They even resolved to place Urban VI. under restraint. But Urban was beforehand with them; he had the renegades imprisoned and tortured in Nocera, and, being besieged in this city by Charles, he spoke the ban and interdict over him. At length he escaped from the power of Charles, and fled to Genoa, where he is said to have punished five cardinals with death. His subsequent expedition against Naples was unsuccessful. Urban died on the 15th of October, 1389, at Rome, and was succeeded by Peter Tomacelli (Boniface IX.), a Neapolitan,—a gentle and pious man, against whom the anti-Pope, whose rule was very bitterly oppressive to the French Church, pronounced anathema. Boniface restored the papal supremacy in the States of the Church, reinstated the cardinals deposed by Urban, and invested Ladislaus, the son of Charles III., with Naples, as with a fief of the Holy See. In order to bring about a happy termination of this miserable schism, Boniface had recourse to Charles VI. of France. The king consulted the University of Paris, which during the time of Urban, and again in 1390, had already offered its services as mediator.

The university, in 1394, proposed three modes of restoring peace,—cession, compromise, and an œcumenical council. The anti-Pope and his abettors—the Cardinal Peter de Luna and the Duke of Berry, brother to the king—tried every means in their power to frustrate their efforts; but they did not attain their object. The university was not intimidated by the threats of Charles VI., and the sick king was finally compelled to require the Pope of Avignon and his cardinals to work for the union. The cardinals were already inclined to accept the proposals made to them, when Robert of Geneva died, on the 16th of September, 1394, from vexation at the

Digitized by Google

"poisonous letter" of the university, and the conduct of his cardinals.

Notwithstanding the admonitions of the king to the contrary, the schismatic Pope had a successor on the 28th of September, in the person of the crafty and ambitious Peter de Luna (Benedict XIII.), who knew how to entice to his court several distinguished men, as Peter d'Ailly, Nicholas of Clemange, and even St. Vincent Ferrer.[1] The last, however, soon withdrew from his party.

On the 2d of February, 1395, Charles VI. called an assembly of prelates and learned men to Paris, who, in union with the university, proposed the cession[2] of both Popes, as a means of settling the schism. The French court adopted the proposal, and sought by special embassies to induce the curia of Avignon and the Christian courts to accede to it.

The envoys of the king and of the university obtained from Peter de Luna only empty promises; and when the cardinals, in accordance with the oath they had taken at the conclave, wished to decide in favor of the resignation, the anti-Pope rejected this in a special bull. Meantime, by making large promises and by offering him the tithes of the Church, Peter de Luna sought to change the mind of the King of France and his court. The embassy had a better result with King Richard II. of England and Henry of Castile, who, in union with France in 1397, required both the anti-Pope and Boniface to resign.

Boniface could not entertain such a proposition, and Peter de Luna remained obstinate. The French court, which in 1398 had gained over the German king Wenceslaus to approve of the cession, on July 28, 1398, renounced obedience to the Pope of Avignon, whereupon eighteen cardinals of said Pope left him. Peter de Luna, besieged in his own palace, was now willing to resign, provided his opponent would either resign, or die, or be deposed.

But before the two kings, Richard and Wenceslaus, could perform their promise of obliging the lawful Pope to resign, they themselves were hurled from their thrones, which fact improved the condition of Boniface. The circumstances surrounding the anti-Pope also took a more favorable turn. He escaped from imprisonment in 1402; the cardinals who had deserted him fell prostrate at his feet to ask his pardon, and in 1403 France returned to obedience under him.

[1] St. Vincent Ferrer. Translated from the French by Rev. Fr. Dixon.

[2] Five propositions were made; namely, the three above-named, proposed by the university in 1394, and two new ones, — to conquer Boniface IX. by the sword, or by persuasion to induce him and his adherents to acknowledge the anti-Pope.

Digitized by Google

Under these circumstances the termination of the schism by means of cession could no longer be thought of. Yet the cardinals did not lose sight of it. The successors of Boniface (who had died Oct. 10, 1404), — with whom, to save appearances, the anti-Pope entered into negotiations, — Innocent VII. (+ Nov. 6, 1406)[1] and Gregory XII.,[2] had to promise, before their election, to resign their dignity should the maintenance of peace require it. A national synod at Paris at first proposed an œcumenical council, but afterwards decided to call on the anti-Pope to resign his pretensions of his own accord, and threatened to withdraw from their obedience to him if he resisted.

The anti-Pope then entered into negotiations with Gregory XII. But the conference between the two Popes, projected in Marseilles, 1407, to be held at Savona, did not come off. Gregory feared to repair to this city, which was under the dominion of France, and the anti-Pope refused to accept any other city proposed to him.

Pope Gregory, who was very much influenced by his relatives, had meantime, in violation of the word he had plighted in conclave, created several new cardinals, and thereby so greatly exasperated the other cardinals who had been his friends, that in May, 1408, they fled to Pisa, renounced obedience to their master, and appealed to a general council. Those cardinals who belonged to the other party, at a conference held at Leghorn, joined them; and both obediences now resolved in common to hold an œcumenical council for the re-establishment of the peace of the Church. Peter de Luna tried to frustrate this intention by holding a synod at Perpignan, and Gregory convoked a council to assemble at Pentecost, 1409, in the patriarchate Aquileja or in the province of Ravenna. The united cardinals, however, persevered in their opposition, and from Leghorn summoned an œcumenical council to be held at Pisa.

Although the reasons alleged by the rebellious cardinals in justification of their conduct were invalid, many prelates and learned men took their part, as also most of the European courts; therefore no further notice was taken of the objections urged against the validity or legitimacy of the synod.[3]

[1] Cardinal Cosimo Migliorati, a learned and virtuous man, who announced that he would summon an œcumenical council to put an end to the schisms, but could not bring this to pass on account of the insecurity of the times.

[2] Cardinal Angelo Corrario, from Venice.

[3] Gregory in his protestation asserts that the cardinals had pronounced judgment without the mediation of the judges, and that they had convoked a synod to obtain a

Digitized by Google

In 1408 France had yielded obedience to the anti-Pope. In the following year the German princes of the empire expressed themselves in favor of neutrality and of recognition of the synod.

King Wenceslaus of Bohemia, in the hope of recovering the German throne, was misled into deserting Gregory, whose proposals of mediation were rejected by the cardinals.

§ 126. *The Council of Pisa.*

The council summoned by the cardinals of both obediences met at Pisa, and was opened on the 25th of March, 1409. A great number of spiritual and temporal dignitaries, the envoys of several courts, and the delegates of many universities arrived there on the appointed day. Only the German king Rupert, and Ladislaus of Naples, remained faithful to Gregory XII., and by their ambassadors entered a protest against the legitimacy of the council; Spain, Portugal, and Scotland, on the other hand, adhered to the anti-Pope.

Under the presidency of Guido of Malesec, the senior cardinal, the Council of Pisa, supported by the arguments of Peter d' Anchorano, a jurisconsult of Bologna, declared itself in its eighth session œcumenical, and asserted that it truly represented the whole Church. It proceeded to devote its first labors to the adjustment of the schism. The two contending claimants, Gregory XII. and Peter de Luna, were cited in the customary form, and at the fifteenth session were declared deposed from their rights and dignities. The proposals made to the council by Gregory through Charles Malatesta, Prince of Rimini, were not accepted; neither were those presented by the deputies of Peter de Luna.

Having previously determined that the future Pope should not dissolve the council before the enactment of the necessary reforms, the cardinals of both obediences, being for *this time* authorized so to do by the synod, proceeded to the election of a new Pope. On the 26th of June their choice fell on the Archbishop of Milan, Cardinal Peter Philargi of Candia, who took the name of Alexander V.

Under his presidency the council continued its sessions for a

sanction for that judgment; that the Pope alone could summon an œcumenical council; that he was willing to put off the council summoned by himself, if he could come to an understanding with the cardinals, and to leave the fixing of the place where they should meet to two umpires appointed by himself and the cardinals. He could not attend the Council of Pisa without compromising the dignity of the Holy See.

Digitized by Google

short time, during which Philargi ratified the decrees of the synod passed previously to his election, and several wholesome decrees of reform were enacted; after which the council was adjourned for three years, and appointed to meet again in 1412 to continue as the Council of Pisa. But what had been foretold by Rupert, King of Germany, was now verified: this result was but a triplication of the schism, for three persons now laid claim to the papal tiara.

Gregory XII., who had held the council convoked by himself in Cividale, found a refuge in Gaeta; Peter de Luna remained at Perpignan; and the Pope of Pisa took up his residence in Bologna.

Here the latter died in 1410; his successor, Balthasar Cossa (John XXIII.), who alienated even Ladislaus of Naples from the legitimate Pope, convened the council appointed by his predecessor, in Rome, 1412. But few prelates responded to the summons; and the whole business that occupied them consisted in rejecting some propositions of Wycliffe. For the reformation of the Church nothing was done.

Although Cossa struggled for a long time against convening a reformatory synod, he was at length obliged to yield to the general wish of Christendom. Pressed by Ladislaus of Naples, he complied with the demand of the German king, Sigismund, and convoked a council, which was opened with all due solemnity at Constance, 1414.

§ 127. *The Council of Constance.*

The numerous prelates, the deputies from the universities, the temporal princes and their plenipotentiaries, who now were assembled together at Constance, recognized as the chief objects of the synod, the condemnation of the heresy of John Huss, the reformation of the Church in its Head and members, but principally the termination of the unhappy papal schism.

To effect this union in the quickest manner, and chiefly to paralyze the influence of the many bishops nominated by Cossa, the assembled members of the council, on the motion of Cardinals Filastre, D'Ailly, and others, decided, contrary to what had hitherto been ecclesiastical practice, (1) That in affairs of the union not only the bishops, but every member of the council, should be entitled to vote; and (2) That the votes should be taken, not by a majority of episcopal suffrages, but by that of the representatives of nations, of which at the beginning four, but afterwards five, were counted.

Digitized by Google

After this the three contending claimants — Gregory XII., Balthasar Cossa, and Peter de Luna — were required to resign their pretensions of their own free-will, as peace could in this way be best and most easily restored to the Church.

After fruitless efforts to have the decrees already enacted withdrawn, Cossa, intimidated by a memorial presented by an unknown Italian, which contained a series of grave charges against his morals, declared himself willing to abdicate the papal dignity, and in the second session read the prescribed formula of cession; but soon afterwards he escaped, with the assistance of Frederic, Duke of Austria, to Schaffhausen, and showed signs of his intention to dissolve the council.

The council, however, had in the third session taken precautions against any attempt at such a dissolution. In the fourth and fifth session it affirmed, at the instance of D'Ailly and Gerson, the propositions that the council had its authority immediately from Christ, and that the Pope was bound to accept its decisions in matters of faith, in its edict regarding the present schism, as indeed in all things appertaining to the reformation of the Head and members of the Church.

Meantime negotiations with Cossa, who had taken up his abode in Freiburg, were continued, as he had recalled his previous concessions. As these negotiations, however, led to no result, the synod commenced a judicial process against him, and in the twelfth session, on the 29th of May, 1415, proceeded to depose him; seventy-two grave but exaggerated accusations were brought against him. Cossa (John XXIII.), who was taken prisoner by the Margrave Frederic of Brandenburg, and brought to Radolfzell, near Constance, finally submitted to the sentence of the synod.

The lawful Pope, Gregory XII., who as early as January, 1415, had sent an embassy, with Cardinal John Dominici at its head, to Constance, now, at its fourteenth session (July 4), having in the first place recognized and authorized the council presided over by the Emperor Sigismund, thus rendering valid its succeeding acts, sent in his resignation by his ambassador, Charles of Malatesta, providing, in his manner of doing so, for the preservation of the papal dignity and for the maintenance of the legitimacy of the lawful Pope.

The schismatic Peter de Luna was now solicited to do the same, but he obstinately refused to resign the tiara of his own free-will; therefore the council, after several long and fruitless nego-

Digitized by Google

tiations, deposed him from his dignity in the thirty-seventh session, July 26, 1417.

The question whether the election of a Pope or the necessary reforms should first come under discussion was the occasion of vehement debate; the German and English declaring for the latter, the other nations for the former point. In the thirty-ninth and fortieth sessions they at length came to an agreement. The synod passed several decrees of reform, and determined that before the dissolution of the present council the future Pope should take into consideration the reformation of the Church in her Head and members. After this the twenty-three cardinals, with whom, for this special occasion, six deputies from each nation were associated, proceeded to elect a new pontiff as Head of the Church. The choice fell on the noble cardinal Otho Colonna (Nov. 11, 1417), who then ascended the papal throne as Martin V.

Martin V. established a special tribunal of reform, which tribunal consisted of six cardinals and of one deputy for each nation. In January, 1418, he proposed a plan of reform, which was founded on the memorial of the German nation. Nevertheless, as the wishes of each particular nation and their requirements differ, the Pope resolved in the forty-third session to confirm and issue only those decrees that were generally received, and to conclude a separate concordat with each nation individually.

This concluded the acts of the Synod of Constance, and it was left to a new council to accomplish the work of reformation. In the forty-fourth session Martin V. promised that after the lapse of five years he would convoke a council to meet at Pavia; and at the forty-fifth (i. e., the last) session he closed the council.

As to the question whether the Council of Constance may be numbered among the general councils, it is an assured fact that from the forty-second to the forty-fifth session it must be acknowledged as

The Sixteenth Œcumenical Council.

And even the previous decrees have œcumenical authority in so far as they were confirmed by the Pope. This is especially the case in the rejection of the heresies of Wycliffe and of Huss, as also of the reformatory decrees.

I. In regard to the approval of the earlier decrees of the council, Martin V. thus expresses himself: —

1. In the bull "Inter cunctas" of the 22d of February, 1418, against the Wycliffites and Hussites, in which one suspected of heresy is asked, "Utrum

Digitized by Google

credat, quod illud, quod sacrum conc. Const. univ. eccl. repraes. approbavit et approbat *in favorem fidei* et *ad salutem animarum*, quod hoc est ab universis Christi fidelibus approbandum et tenendum?"[1]

2. In his declaration made at the request of the Poles, that he should publicly condemn the libel of the Russian Dominican Falkenberg, against the king and Polish nobility, the Pope speaks thus: that he holds fast, observes, and approves "omnia et singula determinata, conclusa et decreta in *materiis fidei* per praesens sacrum concilium generale Const. *concilialiter*, et non aliter nec alio modo." It is true that this explanation refers proximately to the cause in dispute of Falkenberg, but it has a wider scope in reference to the decrees of the council in general.

3. The decrees of the Council of Constance are therefore not approved unconditionally, but only under certain restrictions.

a. The expressions "concilialiter," in contradistinction to that of "nationaliter" (which means only of individual nations), and "tumultualiter" (which implies the decisions passed in Constance contrary to the right order), partly express these restrictive limitations, which are further partly shown by the words "in materiis fidei" and "ad salutem animarum."

b. Both these speeches of Martin V. thus prove that he only confirmed those decrees of the council which were embraced in the right way ("concilialiter"), and which were passed "in favorem fidei" and "ad salutem animarum."

c. A closer explanation of the restriction under which Martin V. confirmed the decrees of Constance is given by his successor, Eugene IV., in his letter to his legates in Germany July 22, 1446,[2] in the words: "Sicut illi [scl. praedecessores nostri] generalia concilia Constantiense et Basiliense ab ejus initio, usque ad translationem per nos factam, *absque tamen praejudicio juris dignitatis*, et *praeeminentiae s. sedis Apostolicae* . . . cum omni reverentia et devotione suscipimus, complectimur et veneramur."

According to this, all such decrees of Constance as are injurious to the rights, dignity, and supremacy of the Apostolic See are excluded from the papal confirmation.

II. From the foregoing it is seen how the question may be answered, what authority resides in the proposition of Constance: "Concilium supra Papam."

1. Wholly distinct from the contradiction involved in the proposition itself (as a true œcumenical council without the Pope is not conceivable), the very circumstance under which it was uttered impeaches its authority; since,

2. This said proposition was put forth by prelates belonging to Cossa's obedience, and without the assent of the cardinals, and therefore not "concilialiter." To this may be added, —

3. That Martin V. refused to confirm this proposition with the papal approbation; and that, Sept. 4, 1439, Eugene IV. condemned and rejected as "impia, scandalosa," a proposition of the Council of Basle, thirty-third session, referring to it, which set up the proposition of Constance as a dogma ("Sacro approbante concilio, scl. Florent., damnamus et reprobamus").[3]

[1] *Harduin*, viii. 914. [2] *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1446, n. 3. [3] See § 128.

Digitized by Google

4. Finally, because Pope Martin V. at the Council of Constance, by his Constitution of March 10, 1418, affirms: "Nulli fas est, a supremo judice videlicet apostolica sede seu Romano pontifice Jesu Christi vicario appellare aut illius judicium in causis fidei, quae tanquam majores ad ipsum et sedem Apostolicam deferendae sunt, declinare," by which the appeal from the Pope to a general council is forbidden, and which likewise rejects as erroneous the underlying principle of the superiority of an œcumenical council to the Pope, as is even confessed by Gerson himself, the spiritual author of this theory, in the words: "Destruens [scl. the prohibition of the Pope] fundamentale penitus robur nedum Pisani sed Constantiensis concilii, et eorum omnium, quae in eis, praesertim super electione summi pontificis et intrusorum ejectione attentata factaque sunt."[1]

§ 128. *The Popes Martin V. and Eugene IV., and the Councils of Siena and Basle.*

The synod which had been convoked by Martin V. (1417–1431) to assemble at Pavia (1423) was forthwith transferred to Siena on account of the breaking out of a contagious disease. It condemned the heresy of Huss, sketched a plan for reuniting the schismatic Greeks, and excommunicated Peter de Luna and his adherents; but after a few sessions its action was suspended, and the consideration of the so much needed reformation was adjourned to another council, which was convoked for the 20th of February, 1431, while Martin yet lived. The place chosen for the new synod was Basle.

Martin's successor, Gabriel Condulmerio, Eugene IV. (1431–1447), was a nephew of Gregory XII. He confirmed the capitulation made by the cardinals before the election, then issued the bull of convocation, and appointed Cardinal Julian Cesarini to preside at the synod. The small number of prelates who were in attendance, together with the desire to promote negotiations which should reunite the Greek and Latin churches, and other important causes, then induced the Pope, on the 12th of November, 1431, to transfer the council to Bologna, to be opened in that place after the lapse of eighteen months.

But the twelve prelates then assembled at Basle were not satisfied with this transfer; and Julian, who had resigned the presidency, made earnest representations to the Pope in this regard. The twelve prelates held their first session on the 14th of December, defining its aim and scope to be "the extirpation of heresy

[1] Dial. apol. ap. v. d. Hardt. iv. 1532. Compare on this controversy *Ballerini*, De potestate ecclesiastica, etc., p. 98 sqq. See also § 130.

Digitized by Google

and of the Greek schism, the re-establishment of peace among Christian princes, the strengthening of faith, the revival of the ancient discipline, and the reformation of the Church in her Head and members."

The prelates assembled at Basle, who had thus and in other ways already overstepped their rights, being encouraged by the protection of several courts, went further yet. They demanded of Eugene the withdrawal of the bull of dissolution, and in their second session (Feb. 15, 1432) renewed that decree of Constance which affirms that the authority of the council, coming immediately from Christ, was superior to that of the Pope. At the third session (April 29) they cited Eugene and the cardinals to appear before the council within three months, under penalty, if they refused, of incurring the legal punishment. In the fourth session (June 20) they forbade the Pope to create new cardinals, appointed a governor for the County of Avignon, and gave letters of safe conduct to the Bohemians. In the seventh session it was decreed that in case the Apostolic See became vacant, the future Pope could only be elected at the seat of the council (Basle).

Such overstrained propositions as these, which Nicholas of Cusa, in his celebrated work "De concordantia catholica," lib. 3, seeks to defend, would not have been brought forward, had not the "Fathers of Basle" been supported by King Sigismund and other princes. Emboldened by this support, they rejected the conciliatory proposals of Eugene, and in their sixth session (September 6) declared him obstinate ("contumax"); yet, on December 18, in their eighth session, at which Julian presided, they *indulgently,* as they boasted, granted him a respite of sixty days in which to revoke the bull of dissolution.

For the sake of peace, Eugene, whose four legates had been able to effect nothing, sent four new nuncios to Basle, with peaceable[1] proposals, and on Feb. 14, 1433, issued the bull of revocation. The "Fathers of Basle," however, continued their opposition to him, and in the eleventh session (April 27, 1433) declared that a Pope who refused to assist at a general council rendered himself liable to suspension: nay, they wished to pronounce this sentence on Eugene in the thirteenth session; they would not listen to his nuncios; but finally the synod granted him, at the fourteenth session, a new term of grace for ninety days.

[1] *Raynald,* Ad ann. 1432, n. 19, 1433, n. 3. *Aug. Patritii,* Summa conciliorum Basil. Florent., etc., n. 24, ap. *Harduin,* iv. 1104. *Hartzheim,* Conc. Germ. v. 793.

Digitized by Google

Meantime, on the 14th of February, the papal embassy arrived at Basle, bearing the bull of revocation. Sigismund also, after he had been crowned emperor, came to the city. But the synod took exceptions to several expressions in the bull, and treated the legates in an unfriendly manner. In the bull it was affirmed: "Statuimus, volumus et mandamus, quod Basileae sacrum generale concilium per nostros legatos illuc quantocyus transmittendos, qui nomine nostro praesideant, *celebretur*." The members of the synod were not satisfied, because by that sentence it would seem that the council was but just then convoked, which would nullify its previous acts as not being recognized by the Pope. They likewise found fault because Eugene in a bull of May 1, in which he charged his legates to labor for the reformation of the Church in all her members, had omitted to include "in her Head" also. The Pope therefore declared, on the 29th of July, that in sending legates to Basle he had in view, not the formation of a new council, but the continuation of one already existing; but that he rejected all decrees enacted, or yet to be enacted, against his person or against the dignity of the Apostolic See.

To comply with the wishes of the emperor, and to restore peace to the Church, if it were possible to do this by any lawful means, Eugene resolved on a new sacrifice (August 1). He issued a bull by which he acknowledged the synod as a lawful one from its beginning, of which only the decrees against the Apostolic See were to be rejected. He declared his willingness to favor the synod if only the acts against his person and the dignity of the Apostolic See were recalled, and if his legates were admitted in very fact to the presidency. But this did not satisfy the members of the synod. In recognizing conditionally the authority of the synod, Eugene had used the words "we will and are content" ("volumus et contentamur"), while they wanted him to say, "we decree and declare" ("decernimus et declaremus"). This was also done in the bull of Dec. 15, 1433. It was, in fact, the utmost yielding of the sick Pope, who was at that time hard beset by his enemies, together with the discontent shown by the princes at the conduct of the members of the synod, that at the sixteenth session (Feb. 5, 1434) effected a reconciliation between the council and the Pope.

After this restoration of peace with the Apostolic See, the council, at which now a greater number of prelates appeared, numbering, however, at most two hundred bishops and abbots, renewed some good enactments that had been framed at previous synods, and at

Digitized by Google

the same time resumed its opposition to the Apostolic See, and renewed the affirmation that the council was superior to the Pope (eighteenth session, June 26, 1434). Besides Cesarini, there was no papal legate present, as such. The council, which permitted the participation of the legates in the proceedings only conditionally, desired these legates, not as such, but as private individuals, to accept the decrees under oath, especially that of the superiority of the council to the Pope; this they did reluctantly, but in their own name, not in that of the Pope.[1]

The members abolished all annates (twenty-first session, June 9, 1435), without giving any compensation for them to the Pope, and abolished the reservations, while at the same time they imposed taxes on the clergy for their own support. Further, on the 25th of March, 1436, during the twenty-third session, the synod passed new regulations on the mode of the future papal election; on the oath which the newly elected pontiff should take; and on the number, rights, and official duties of the cardinals. It also entered into negotiations with the Greeks, although the Pope had already negotiated with them; granted them, of its own authority, a letter of safe conduct; and had an indulgence published in order to procure the necessary money to defray the travelling expenses of the Greek envoys.

Eugene IV. condemned these decrees, complained to the Christian princes of the arrogance of the prelates of Basle, who in January, 1436, had addressed to him a sharp admonition ("monitorium"); and he also drew up a memorial to the crowned heads, in which he requested them to recall their ambassadors from Basle.

The negotiations respecting the Greek union finally brought about the rupture. The better part of the synod joined the Pope, whose legates had proposed Florence or Udine as the place of the council; the majority, however, guided by Cardinal d'Allemand, Archbishop of Arles, refused to meet in an Italian city.

In the twenty-fifth session (May 7, 1437) vehement discussions took place. The majority decreed that the council should be held at Basle, Avignon, or in a city of Savoy. Eugene confirmed the decision of the minority, which proposed an Italian city; and the Greek ambassadors assented to this. The most eminent of the prelates left Basle. The majority, however, who sought to strengthen themselves by receiving country clergymen and subordinate officials of the bishops, in the twenty-sixth session (July 31, 1437) cited the

[1] Cf. *Turrecremata*, Summ. de eccl. ii. 100. *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1434, n. 14.

Digitized by Google

Pope to appear before their tribunal, and declared, at the twenty-ninth session, the transferring of the council to Ferrara null and void.

Notwithstanding these decisions and denunciations of the "Fathers of Basle," who even threatened Eugene with suspension and deposition, the number of prelates who betook themselves to Ferrara became greater and greater, while the little handful at Basle gradually melted away by slow degrees. The council at Ferrara was opened on the 8th of January, 1438; and the dissatisfaction experienced at Basle at such a defeat deprived the members of the reform synod (who, however, had done very little for reformation) of their senses. At the thirty-first session (Jan. 24, 1438) they suspended the Pope, and at the thirty-second session (March 24) cited the members of the Council of Ferrara[1] to answer for their conduct at Basle. These responded by pronouncing anathema on the pseudo-synod.

Notwithstanding the grave objections to the proposition made by Nicholas Tudeschi,[2] Archbishop of Palermo (Panormitanus), the majority of the council at Basle, guided by D'Allemand, concluded to depose Eugene; while the minority joined the moderate party. For the purpose of the deposition eight new dogmas[3] were framed; of which, in the thirty-third session (May 16, 1439), contrary to the opinions of the majority of bishops present, three were accepted as truths of faith ("fidei cath. veritates"), namely, —

1. The council is above the Pope.

2. Without consent of its members, it can neither be dissolved, prorogued, nor transferred.

3. Any one who denies these truths is a heretic.[4]

Hereupon Pope Eugene IV., against whom not the smallest accusation could be substantiated, was, at the thirty-fourth session, on

[1] In January, 1439, it was transferred to Florence on account of the breaking out of a pestilence.

[2] *Aug. Patr.* l. c. c. 90: "Panormitanus praesul, cum aliter persuadere non posset, secessione facta, duxerit [dixerit] se cum aliis praelatis oratorum, qui majorem partem praelatorum complectebantur, conclusere [concludere] non esse concludendum; et asserentes omne jus concilii apud eos esse, quoniam inferiores non haberent potestatem ineundi suffragia in conciliis generalibus, et maxime in rebus fidei, neque vocem habere nisi consultativam tantum; atque in tantum excanduit, ut colluviem illam copistarum concilium appellaverit; affirmaveritque flagitium fieri ab Arelatensi [scl. D'Allemand], qui *cum tribus episcopis titularibus* (!) omnes consilii praelatos vellet statuere." (*Hard.* ix. 1154.)

[3] *Patr.* l. c. c. 88. *Koch*, Sanctio pragmat. Germ. p. 13.

[4] *Aeneae Sylv.* Hist. Basil. Conc. lib. i. p. 79.

Digitized by Google

the 25th of June, 1439, formally deposed as a heretic by an assembly composed of seven bishops and some other prelates. There were in all but twenty bishops and abbots present at this session; but a much more numerous body of the inferior clergy were in attendance.

Although the greater part of the princes remained faithful to the lawful Pope, and loudly blamed the conduct of the Basilians, as they were now called, these Basilians continued their sittings, notwithstanding the outbreak of a pestilence, and proceeded to a new papal election. The choice fell on Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, who styled himself Felix V., and in the thirty-ninth and fortieth sessions was acknowledged as Pope by the council.

The anti-Pope, thus elected after a very peculiar fashion by a few doctors, prelates, and bishops, received obedience from very few princes and universities. He himself was entirely dependent for his support on the pseudo-synod; and they imposed heavy taxes on the churches subject to them, for his maintenance, till, tired of his irksome position, he withdrew to Lausanne. The synod continued to hold sessions throughout the years 1441 and 1442, and finally dissolved itself after the forty-fifth session (May 16, 1443), in which it was resolved that after the lapse of three years an œcumenical council should be held at Lyons. The obstinate schismatics still remained at Basle, and later on, when expelled by Frederic III., emigrated to Lausanne, where they did not conclude their so-called council till the year 1449.

The Emperor Sigismund, who had at first rejoiced at the convocation of the Synod of Basle, at length, when the expectations he had cherished were not met, withdrew his countenance from it. The electoral princes who were assembled at Frankfort in 1438 to choose a successor to Sigismund declared neither in favor of the Pope nor of the synod. This state of things lasted during the reign of Albert II. (+ 1439) and also under Frederic III.

At a diet held at Mentz (1439), and attended by the ambassadors of the kings of France, Castile, and Portugal, the rights of the Apostolic See were ably defended by Cardinal Cervantes and Nicholas de Cusa; but a new trouble came upon Eugene. The princes demanded the convocation of a general council, while the deposition by Eugene, in 1445, of the two electoral princes, archbishops of Cologne and Treves, both of whom favored the anti-Pope, threatened to cause a rupture; for the other electoral princes concluded, at an assembly, March 21, 1446, to send an embassy to

Digitized by Google

Eugene IV., who should demand from him, (1) His approval of certain decrees of Basle, accepted by themselves; (2) The convocation of a general synod; (3) Acceptance of the article on the superiority of the council over the Pope; and (4) The reinstating of the two deposed archbishops.

Eugene did not negotiate with the ambassadors, at whose head was the boorish Gregory of Heimburg; but by the advice of Frederic III., who had associated Æneas Sylvius of Piccolomini, his private secretary, with the embassy, he sent the Cardinals Thomas of Sarzana, Bishop of Bologna, and Carvajal, together with Nicholas de Cusa, as legates to the diet opened at Frankfort, Sept. 14, 1446. With them Æneas Sylvius labored for the cause of the Apostolic See. He partly succeeded in winning over some of the electoral princes to the cause of the Pope. A new embassy to Eugene IV. was organized. After some negotiations an understanding was come to, shortly before the death of Eugene, which took place on Feb. 23, 1447. Four papal documents were drawn up, which contained the so-called "Concordats of the Princes."[1]

The question of the indemnity to be offered to the Pope for the abolition of the annates, etc., was, according to the decision of the princes assembled at Aschaffenburg (1447), to be settled at the Diet of Nuremberg in 1448. But as early as February 17 of that year, King Frederic III. concluded with Pope Nicholas V. the Concordat of Vienna, which is very similar to the Treaty of Constance, and was recognized as law for the ecclesiastical affairs of Germany.

Twenty-three decrees of the Council of Basle were also received in France in an assembly at Bourges (1438); and on June 7, 1438, these, partly unchanged, partly modified, were signed by the King Charles VII. The document is known as the Pragmatic Sanction; to give it an authorized basis, appeal was made to the dubious Prag-

[1] Printed in (Horix) Concord. nation. Germ. i. 135 sqq. *Koch*, l. c. p. 181 sqq. *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1447, n. 4 sqq. (incomplete). Eugene declared, on February 5, in a document ("salvatorium"): "Quoniam propter imminentem nobis aegritudinem [he died of it shortly after], non valemus omnia per eos [that is, the German ambassadors], petita et per nos concessa, cum ea integritate judicii et consilii examinare et ponderare, quae rerum magnitudo et gravitas requirit, tenore praesentium protestamur, quod per quaecunque a nobis dictis Regi . . . responsa et respondenda, concessa et concedenda, non intendimus in aliquo derogare doctrinae sanctorum patrum, aut praefatae sedis privilegiis et auctoritati, habentes pro non responsis et non concessis quaecunque talia a nobis contigerit emanare." On the transactions in Rome, cf. *Aen. Syl.* ap. *Koch*, p. 309 sqq.

Digitized by Google

matic Sanction of Louis IX. (1268).[1] It contains very pernicious principles, especially concerning the relations between the Pope and the council, and in after times served as the basis of the so-called Gallican Liberties.

The Council of Basle — but only in the degree in which its measures were recognized by the Pope — and the Council of Ferrara-Florence, which Eugene summoned as the continuation of that of Basle, together form

The Seventeenth Œcumenical Council.

Respecting the Council of Basle, therefore, the first twenty-five sessions are to be distinguished from the rest. The latter ones are obviously schismatic; and even of the former only those decrees are to be regarded as œcumenical which treat of the extirpation of heresy, of the maintenance of peace in Christendom, and of the reformation of the Church in its head and members, without derogating from the dignity of the Apostolic See.[2]

§ 129. *The last Popes of this Epoch, — Nicholas V. to Leo X.*

Eugene's successor,[3] Thomas of Sarzana (Nicholas V., 1447–1455), a great friend and promoter of learning, and the founder of the Vatican Library, after adjusting the schism, held in 1450 a glorious jubilee at Rome, combated the heretics, and devoted his whole time and exertions to the reconquest of Constantinople, which in 1453 had fallen into the hands of the Turks. The same course was pursued by Calixtus III. (1455–1458), Alphonsus Borgia from Xativa. To him the credit of the victory near Belgrade in 1456 was due; but on account of the indifference to the cause shown by Christian princes, he obtained no more enduring result than his predecessor had done. This able Pope was unfortunately not free from nepotism; he appointed two of his nephews cardinals in one day, and made a third governor of the Castle of St. Angelo and Duke of Spoleto. It was probably on this account that the cardinals after his death framed a capitulation of election, by which restrictions were placed on the papal prerogatives.

[1] Cf. Histoire contenant l'origine de la pragmatique sanction et des concordats in Traitez des droits et libertés de l'église Gallicane, Paris, 1731, tom. i. p. 2, p. 29 sqq.

[2] See *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, i. p. 54 (2d ed. p. 62) sqq.

[3] On the succeeding Popes, see *Christophe*, Histoire de la papauté pendant le 15 siècle, avec les pièces justificatives. 2 vol. Lyons et Paris, 1863. (From the pontificate of Martin V.) On Nicholas V., see *Manetti*, Vita Nicol.

Digitized by Google

His successor, the learned Æneas Sylvius (Pius II., 1458–1464), had in his youth led a somewhat profligate life, and had ranged himself on the side of the Council of Basle and of the anti-Pope. In the year 1442 the Emperor Frederic III. took him into his service, and sent him with the embassy of the electoral princes to Rome. Here he became fully reconciled to Pope Eugene, received priest's orders, and from that time forth was a sincere adherent of the Apostolic See. Soon after his election to the papal throne Pius summoned the Christian princes (1459) to meet him at Mantua, for consultation on the Turkish question. Here, although the hopes of the Pope to excite the enthusiasm and obtain the aid of the Christian princes signally failed, his own zeal did not falter. Although sick, he first endeavored by an elaborate letter to convert the Sultan; when that failed, he, on the 19th of June, 1464, hastened to Ancona to place himself at the head of the Crusaders. Here he died on the 14th of August.

At Mantua, in 1459, Pius II. had already forbidden any new appeals to a general council, under pain of excommunication, which, in fact, he had pronounced on Diether v. Isenburg, Archbishop of Mentz. His endeavors to obtain from the French king, Louis XI., the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, were frustrated by the opposition of Parliament. A plan of reform, devised by Nicholas of Cusa, was unfortunately never carried into effect.

In the bull "In minoribus agentes" Pius retracted his former erroneous views on the Pope and the council, to which he had given utterance chiefly at Basle, and which, before he became cardinal, he had already known to be untenable.

He was succeeded by a nephew of Eugene, Cardinal Peter Barbo of Venice, the pomp-loving Paul II. (1464–1471), who rejected the capitulation edict of election, which had been made in the conclave, and created three of his nephews cardinals. As respects his conduct in other matters, Platina († 1481) is not a trustworthy biographer. Hatred guides his pen against this Pope, because he abolished the court of the seventy-two Abbreviators, against which charges of simony and other notorious corruptions had been made, and had ordered a criminal investigation to be entered into respecting the members of the Academy of Sciences. It is certain, however, that during the reign of Paul II. nothing was done for the restoration of the ancient Church discipline.

Nor did the pontificate of the learned and art-loving Franciscan, Pope Sixtus IV. (1471–1484), bring better times to the Church. Im-

Digitized by Google

mediately after his elevation he indeed began to interest himself in prosecuting the war against the threatening Turk; but he beheld himself forsaken by the Christian princes, and he then turned all his attention to Italian affairs. Misled by his relatives, to whom he was much attached, he gave his consent to the plan of the Pazzi family to overturn the dominion of the Medici in Florence, on condition, however, that no blood should be shed. But the plot failed; and the conspirators, among whom was Francesco dei Salviati, whom Lorenzo de' Medici had refused to acknowledge as Archbishop of Pisa, were immediately put to death. Excommunication and other censures pronounced against Lorenzo, nay, the interdict itself laid on the whole territory of Florence, passed noiselessly over them, producing no result. Neither was anything to be effected by force of arms. King Louis XI. of France sided with the Florentine Lorenzo, who even won over to his cause the King of Naples, the Pope's own ally. The capture of Otranto by the Turks at length made Sixtus more placable, and in 1480 brought about a reconciliation between him and the penitent Florentines.

No less fatal for the Church was the position of the Pope towards Venice. Sixtus was at first the ally of the city against Duke Este of Ferrara; but when he afterwards made peace with the duke, the Venetians continued the war by themselves, and took no heed of the warning of the Pope to desist. When Sixtus pronounced ecclesiastical censures on the Venetians in order to render the continuation of the war impossible, they disregarded alike ban and interdict, and appealed to an œcumenical council. Even in Rome, the city beautified with magnificent buildings by the Pope, insecurity made itself felt more and more. In the States of the Church the Orsini sided with the Pope; the Colonnas and Savelli against him.

Had the cardinals, after the death of Sixtus, instead of framing a capitulation of election, chosen a Pope who with a strong hand would have resisted the malpractices of selling offices, and have curbed the worldly spirit among the members of the curia, the mistrust then prevalent against Rome might possibly have decreased; now, the choice that fell on Cardinal John Baptist Cibo of Genoa (Innocent VIII., 1484–1492) could serve but to its increase.

Elevated by bribery to the papal chair, this Pope, who, after spending his youth in frivolity, had received holy orders, was a patron of art and science, and had the good fortune to put an end

Digitized by Google

to the anarchy that had prevailed in Rome.[1] He tried to put an end to sorcery and witchcraft, and summoned all Christendom to take up arms against the Turks. For keeping in captivity Prince Dschem (Zizim) he received a yearly payment of forty thousand ducats from the Sultan Bajazet; and by doing so, he preserved peace for Christendom. But Innocent did not labor earnestly to eradicate abuses. Complaints of bribery and corruption among the members of the curia, whose number he considerably increased, became louder and louder, and crimes became more and more frequent in Rome.[2] Innocent's alliance with Lorenzo de' Medici, whose thirteen-year-old son John afterwards became Pope Leo X., and who already possessed many benefices while he was at this time created cardinal, gave him support. His son Francis obtained the hand of Magdalene de' Medici.

After the death of Innocent VIII., in 1492, the twenty-three cardinals, of whom fifteen were bribed, proceeded to elect Rodrigo (Lenzuoli) Borgia to the papal chair, under the name of Alexander VI. (1492–1503). It is beyond dispute that this Pope possessed vigor of intellect, sagacity in business matters, with an affable and courteous demeanor[3] especially to the poor and middle classes. At his enthronization, however, pagan frivolity vied with low flattery, in Rome, to greet his accession; and to this succeeded the most shameless pasquinades and lampoons on the Pope himself. In fact, the bright side of Alexander's character was fearfully obscured by dark shadows; but an accurate picture of his life can scarcely be drawn, because the notices we have of it differ so much one from the other, and ofttimes bear on their front the marks of exaggeration and untruth.[4] Before his elevation, Alexander had

[1] "Pater patriae." What *Steph. Infessura* (+ 1494) says in the diary he wrote, "Diarium urbis Romae ab ann. 1294–1494," concerning the condition of the Romans and the character of the last Popes, is to be taken with great caution, as the vehement and calumniating author permits himself great exaggerations and unjust representations. *Muratori*, who edited the diary (Script. rer. ital. iii. 2), names him as "proclivis ad maledicentiam" (l. c. 1109). Cf. *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1490, n. 22.

[2] So says *Infessura*, Ad ann. 1489, ap. *Muratori*, l. c. 1226.

[3] Cf. *Corio*, Storia di Milano, vii. 888 sqq. One inscription runs thus —

> "Caesare magna fuit, nunc Roma est maxima, Sextus
> Regnat Alexander, ille vir, iste Deus."

See *Roscoe*, Life and Pontificate of Pope Leo X.

[4] The heavy accusations of the scandalous Burchard, of Strasburg, Bishop of Città di Castellana, and Master of the Ceremonies in Rome (+ 1506), were weakened, (1) By the unreliable character of the man, of whom his successor, *Paris de Grassis*, says

Digitized by Google

had five children by the Lady Vanozza de Catanei. His son John was created Duke of Gandia, by Ferdinand the Catholic; another son, Cæsar Borgia, became Archbishop of Valencia, and obtained the cardinal's hat. The relations which Alexander bore to temporal sovereigns were on the whole friendly. By the celebrated meridian line he staved off the outbreak of contention between Spain and Portugal; he also regulated the missionary work in the New World.

Alexander lived in peace with the Emperor Frederic III., and with his successor Maximilian I. On the other hand, he fell into discord with Charles VIII. of France about Naples; and on the 31st of December, 1494, Charles entered Rome, but eventually was constrained to withdraw from Italy. The attempt of the king to convoke a general council against the Pope was frustrated by his death. With his successor, Louis XII., the Pope was on the best of terms. Cæsar Borgia, who after the assassination of his brother laid aside the cardinalate with the full consent of the Pope, married a French princess, with whom he received the Dukedom of Valentinois as her dower, to which Alexander added a principality in Romagna. By degrees the papal dominion over the States of the Church was restored.

The assassination of the Duke of Gandia, which was falsely ascribed to his brother Cæsar, deeply affected Alexander, and turned his attention more forcibly to the condition of ecclesiastical affairs. He commissioned six cardinals to draw up a scheme of reform; he even showed symptoms of being willing to resign the tiara; but this frame of mind was not of long continuance. The reform scheme was not carried into execution; and the warning voices of Christian princes, who, it is true, did not place themselves in a proper position towards the Church, remained unheeded. The daring, genial, and highly endowed Jerome Savonarola, the reformatory demagogue in the monk's habit, was, on the charge of having uttered false prophecies and of having by his sermons instigated the people to sedition, handed over to secular authority, and condemned by it to the death he underwent on the 23d of May, 1498.

Something, however, was done for the welfare of the Church. The discovery of America by Christopher Columbus presented an opportunity to the Apostolic See to propagate the Christian faith in the New World, and the destruction of the Moorish kingdom in

(Diarium ad ann. 1506), that he was "non solum non humanus, sed supra omnes bestias bestialissimus, inhumanissimus, invidiosissimus; and (2), Because he asserts many things from rumor alone. *Ollivier*, Le pape Alex., Paris, 1870; Hist. du Pape Alex. VI., 1882.

Digitized by Google

Spain (1492) restored the dominion of Christianity to that realm. By increasing the severity of the penalties for reading heretical and dangerous books, the Pope hindered such works from spreading.

The report of an incestuous intercourse between Alexander and his daughter Lucretia[1] is a vile calumny, as is also the accusation that he was the murderer of Prince Dschem. Yet he well deserves the reproach of having done nothing to stem the torrent of an ever-increasing corruption among the higher grades of the clergy and laity; and of having, by tolerating the conduct that prevailed at his own court, contributed not a little to bring religion into contempt. But Alexander was essentially more of a worldly than a spiritual prince. Neither he himself nor the most of those who surrounded him were able to grasp the true idea of the Church, or to comprehend what is involved in the exalted office of her supreme head. But also in this Pope the promise given to the Prince of the Apostles was verified.

After his death,—which was occasioned by a malignant fever, and not by poison, as some have asserted,—the pious cardinal Piccolomini, whose heart and soul were animated with zeal for the reformation of the Church in its head and in its members, was, in September, 1503, elevated to the papal chair, under the name of Pius III. He reigned but twenty-six days, and was succeeded by the Cardinal Archbishop of Ostia, Julian of Rovere, a nephew of Sixtus IV., who took the name of Julius II.

The pontificate of this Pope is pre-eminently of a political character. Julius II. was of an open, honest disposition; he was an able ruler and a brave general; but to these qualities were not united the peculiar attributes of a truly Apostolic Head. Too much occupied with things exterior, Julius directed too little of his attention to things interior. He restored the papal rights in the States of the Church, and crushed the power of the mighty Cæsar Borgia. To punish the Venetians, he joined the League of Cambray, and fought the haughty signora alike with spiritual as with temporal weapons; on their humbling themselves before him, Julius, fearing the preponderance of French power in Italy, became reconciled with the republic. The discontent which this reconciliation called forth in the mind of Louis XII. was fostered by the action taken by Pope Julius against Alphonso Este, Duke of Ferrara, and finally occasioned a breach between him and the King of France. The

[1] See *Roscoe*.

Digitized by Google

Synod of Tours, convoked by the king, entered into his plans, and threatened the Pope with a general council.

Louis was strongly supported by some cardinals, who, angry at the refusal of the Pope to convoke a general council, deserted him, and under the protection of France (1511) convoked a general synod to be held at Pisa. Maximilian I., whose ambassadors had been able to effect nothing at Rome, entered eagerly into the plan.

Notwithstanding this, this undertaking of the cardinals met with no encouragement in the main body of Christianity, which, dreading a schism, disapproved of the action of the cardinals. Driven out of Pisa, they continued their sessions successively in Milan, Asti, and Lyons, but without result. Meantime, in July, 1511, the Pope convoked at Rome

The Eighteenth Œcumenical Council (Lat. V.),

the main objects of which were given out to be: (1) The restoration of peace among Christian princes: (2) The war against the Turks; (3) The reformation of the Church in its head and members. The council was opened on the 19th of April, 1512. Its authority was recognized by the Emperor Maximilian I. At the beginning there were present fifteen cardinals and seventy-nine bishops; this number was afterwards increased to one hundred and twenty. The most of them were of Italy. In the fifth session a decree against simony at papal elections was passed, and confirmed by the Pope. Julius II., who had excluded the renegade cardinals from the council, died after that, and was succeeded by John de' Medici (Leo X.).

Trained in the schools of the Humanists, a lover of splendor and a man of extravagant habits, this celebrated member of the house of Medici was conversant with the art of attracting to himself learned men and artists, but he was not by any means so conversant with the knowledge of how to renew the spirit of Jesus Christ in Christendom.

The sittings of the council were continued: several reformatory decrees were framed; but only palliative measures were adopted, the axe was not laid at the root of the evil. Towards its conclusion France also acceded to the council, and the concordat[1] between Leo X. and King Francis I. removed the offensive Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. This was approved by the council; further, a bull proclaimed the superiority of the Pope to all councils, shortly after which the council was closed (March 16, 1517).

[1] *Nussi*, Conventiones, p. 20 sqq. Cf. St. a. M. Laach, iii. 222 sqq.

Digitized by Google

In vain the Dominican general Thomas de Vio (Gaetanus), who had an anxious presentiment of the coming storm, conjured them to continue their sessions, and with a strong hand to complete the work of reformation. The Fathers were dismissed at the close of the twelfth session.

On this subject Cardinal Hergenröther says: "This early closing of the council has frequently been considered as a measure somewhat over-hasty and injurious to the interests of the Church, especially as it was in the autumn of that self-same year that the mighty storm of the Reformation broke forth in Germany. Yet a longer continuation of this council would scarcely have prevented this storm from arising or have lessened its intensity when arisen. The council could only frame laws, and there was already no lack of wholesome laws; the failure was in the observance of these laws, and in the power to enforce such observance. The numerous decrees of Basle had effected no renovation of ecclesiastical life; they had worked no improvement in the weakness that pervaded the central power, rather had they increased the influence of the secular power over the formation of the arrangements of the Church. A dangerous revolutionary movement was in process, — a movement that could not be suppressed; it had to take its course, had to abide the time in which to manifest all its fruits. It was only through great and saintly men that help could come; and these were raised up by God in large numbers when the necessities of the Church had reached their extremity, when human pride was at the end of its wisdom. It was only by the painful operation of throwing off from itself the matter engendered by revolutionary disease, that the health of the body of the Church could be restored."[1]

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR AFFAIRS OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

1. Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.

§ 130. *The Primacy.*

In order to discuss more fully the labors and achievements of the Apostolic See at this epoch, and to place these in the various phases

[1] *Hergenröther*, ii. p. 139.

Digitized by Google

in which they may be viewed, it is necessary to consider more closely the relations in which the Popes stood to the Christian sovereigns and those in which they stood to other members of the Church.

The Pope, as the acknowledged head of the Church, was the common father of all Christians,—of the "respublica Christiana" in its two forms, the Christian Church and the Christian State. To him, as Vicar of Christ, all had to be subordinated; while he himself was responsible to God alone, without his power from this cause being able to degenerate into caprice.[1]

As to the relationship which the spiritual bears to the temporal, especially that which the Pope bears to Christian rulers, both spiritual and temporal rulers acknowledge that their power proceeds from God; and in doing so, they deduce the necessity of the existence of an interior harmony with each other, and proclaim the superiority of the spiritual over the temporal power.[2]

In consequence of this superiority, the Church claimed for her Supreme Head the right to admonish and to punish temporal princes without thereby arrogating to herself the dominion of the world ("dominium mundi"), and without looking on princes as her

[1] This has been declared by the Pope innumerable times. Paschal II. says: "Ad hoc in ecclesia Dei constituti sumus, ut ecclesiae ordinem et patrum debeamus praecepta servare" (Ep. 225, ap. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. clxiii. col. 214). Pius VII. sent word to the allied princes of the ecclesiastical provinces of the upper Rhine: "The Pope finds, in the very nature and in the constitution of the Church, of which he is the head, certain limits, which he may not overstep without violating his conscience and misusing the exalted power which Jesus Christ confided to his care for the edification, not for the destruction, of His Church" (Esposizione dei sentimenti di sua Santità, etc.).

[2] See *Hergenröther*, Catholic Church and Christian State, pp. 351, 412. *Gerson*, De modis uniendi ac reformandi eccl. c. 2.: "Ecclesia Christi est inter omnes respublicas aut societates recte ordinatas a Christo superior, nobilior ac diligibilior" (Op. ii. 163). *Ivo Carnot*, Ep. 238 ad Paschal. pap.: "Novit paternitas vestra, quia cum regnum et sacerdotium inter se conveniunt, bene regitur mundus, floret et fructificat ecclesia. Cum vero inter se discordant, non tantum parvae res non crescunt, sed etiam magnae res miserabiliter dilabuntur." Innocent II. wrote to the Emperor Lothaire: "Si auctoritas sacra pontificum et potestas imperialis vere glutino charitatis ad invicem copulentur, Omnipotenti debitus famulatus libere poterit exhiberi et christianus populus grata pace et tranquillitate gaudebit" (*Watterich*, Rom. pont. vitae, ii. 209). The Emperor Frederic I. writes: "Regiae majestatis dignitas postulat, quae et pacis et concordiae bonum spectare noscuntur attenta sollicitudine stabilire, et ut inter regnum et sacerdotium indissolubili caritate bonum ipsum perpetuo perseveret, diligenti studio et exacta diligentia laborare." *Pertz*, Mon. Germ. Hist. iv. 93.

Digitized by Google

vassals; on the contrary, the Popes repeatedly declared that in *purely temporal* matters kings had no one over them, and that the power of the Church in their regard was a spiritual one, which touched temporal things only indirectly.[1] Of this right the Pope was obliged to make use as mediator of peace between contending princes, as protector of the subjects against princely despots, and as defender of the right against tyranny and caprice.

The mutual relations existing between the spiritual and temporal powers are appropriately symbolized under the figure of the sun and moon[2] or of that of the two swords.[3] It has already been made clear, in the foregoing history of the relative position between Church and State, that in the course of time various changes occurred which led to repeated and often violent conflicts between Emperor and Pope, and to learned controversies, in which, not being always animated by a tranquil and edifying spirit, the authors sometimes lost sight of the object in view in the treatises and poems which they published.

Even as the political position occupied by the Pope among Christian nations was not attained by cunning or by arrogance, so neither are the rights exercised by the Popes within the Church a product of the pseudo-Isidorean decretals, or of other causes; they are simply an outcome of that supreme power conferred by Christ on St. Peter and his successors, the division of which into *essential* and *non-essential* rights was first invented by the Febronians.

This supreme power was made use of by the Popes in various ways, according to the exigence of the movement which called it forth. The circumstances that arose in course of time determined the manner of its action; such were, chiefly, the encroachments of the temporal power upon the rights of the Church, the weakness or injustice of many metropolitans and the encroachments of

[1] Cf. Innoc. III. Decretal. *Per Venerabilem*, c. 13, x., Qui filii sint legitimi (iv. 17): "Cum rex ipse superiorem in temporalibus minime recognoscat," etc. . . Verum etiam in aliis regionibus [i.e. outside the States of the Church], certis causis inspectis *temporalem jurisdictionem casualiter exercemus*, non quod alieno juri praejudicare velimus," etc. See *Hergenröther*, p. 373 sqq.

[2] Innoc. III. Ep. lib. i. ep. 401, lib. ii. ep. 294. Cf. Gesta Innoc. c. 63: "Ad firmamentum coeli, h. e. universalis ecclesiae fecit Deus duo magna luminaria, i.e. duas magnas instituit dignitates, quae sunt pontificalis auctoritas et regalis potestas, sed illa qui praeest diebus, i. e. spiritualibus, major est; quae vero carnalibus, minor est, ut, quanta est inter solem et lunam, tanta inter pontifices et reges differentia cognoscatur."

[3] See § 123.

Digitized by Google

some bishops. This rendered it necessary that it should fall within the actual jurisdiction of the Popes, (1) To examine, confirm, transfer, or depose bishops; (2) To cite the complaints against bishops before their own tribunal; (3) To lay the right of dispensation enjoyed by the bishops under greater restrictions, as also their privilege of excommunicating and of laying a country under an interdict.

The relation of the bishop to the Pope is appropriately expressed in the declaration of Innocent III., that the bishops were "vocati in partem sollicitudinis;"[1] and in the vow of canonical obedience,[2] which since the time of Gregory VII. has been enjoined on metropolitans and at a later period on all bishops.

Besides this, the Popes at this epoch exercised, more than they formerly had done, their supreme right of conferring all ecclesiastical benefices. (1) They recommended ("preces") certain candidates for vacant benefices, or ordered them to be installed ("literae monitoriae et praeceptoriae"), or themselves performed the installation ("lit. executoriae"); they also granted expectances ("expectationes") of benefices about to be vacant. (2) They reserved for themselves the privilege of filling up certain prebends ("reservationes"), and bestowed others as *commendams*, by which means they not only rewarded many deserving men, and supported those among the clergy who had been robbed of their means or who had been driven away for their fidelity to the Apostolic See, but they also promoted learning, and rendered the foundation and existence of many universities possible; while the monastic institutions placed formidable counteracting influences to the spirit of caste, pride, and ambition in the higher classes, and to the overreaching pretensions of the power of the laity.

Finally, the Popes, in virtue of their supreme power of taxing the churches, either conjointly with other bishops or separately, laid extraordinary imposts on individual churches or clergymen for the support of the Crusades, for the foundation and maintenance of the higher establishments of learning, and for any other object of general utility, asking special taxes of them for the maintenance of the curia.

The various kinds of tribute thus paid to the Holy See, which were not, however, a special introduction of this epoch, but had

[1] C. 4, x., De auctoritate et usu pallii (i. 8).

[2] Respecting this oath, which is by no means an oath of vassalage, as has been falsely asserted, see *Thomassin*, Vetus et nova eccl. disciplin. ii. 2, c. 43 sqq.

Digitized by Google

already, at least partially, been levied in preceding ages, were: (1) The fruits of the first year ("fructus medii temporis, jus deportus"), which were taken from vacant prebends, and from moneys left at the death of clergymen; (2) The annates, which had their origin in a practice usual in the early ages, both in the East and West, of presenting gifts at ordinations ("emphanistica," "inthronistica," "benedictio," "oblatio"), which were taken from the benefices conferred by the Popes either outside ("annata Bonifaciana") or in the consistory ("servitia communia et minuta"); (3) The income from confirmation and the Pallium fees; (4) The taxes for dispensations.

Other taxes which the Pope received from different countries were: (1) Peter's pence, which were first paid in England; (2) The tribute paid by such princes, cities, and cloisters as placed themselves under the special protection of the Pope; (3) The feudal tax, paid by the vassals of the Holy See to the Pope.

As Supreme Head of the Church, the Bishop of Rome had even yet greater titles to special honor.[1] It was on this account that the Middle Ages called him exclusively "Papa," "Vicarius Christi," "Vicarius Dei," at times also "Vicarius Petri." The wearing of a mitre which, since Nicholas II., was adorned with two,[2] and, from the time of Clement V., with three crowns ("tiara," "triregnum," "mitra turbinata"); the erect crosier ("pedum rectum"); the many testimonies of respect and veneration shown him, such as kissing the foot, the holding of the stirrup by the emperor ("officium stratoris") on whom the Pope conferred the crown, — all testify to the honor in which he was held, which the above-named and other practices only symbolized.

Although the rights which the Popes exercised had their foundation in the very nature of the primacy itself, and are therefore anything but unwarrantable assumptions, yet in the course of time, and principally towards the end of this epoch, loud complaints were made of the oppressions and demands for money by the Pope. These complaints, if in part they were utterly unfounded, as was sometimes the case, yet were also in part owing to the too frequent use made by the Popes of their incontestable rights, as also to the conduct of their officers.

It was especially at the time of the conflicts with the Hohenstaufens that the Popes found themselves compelled, by stern necessity, to lay heavier taxes on certain churches, to depose disobedient

[1] See §§ 52, 95.

[2] Others ascribe the introduction of the twofold crown to Boniface VIII. (1297).

Digitized by Google

bishops, and to reward faithful clergymen for the loss of their incomes by compensating them with the gift of benefices in other lands. The discontent arising from this cause not infrequently found vent in sundry places, in complaints of the extortions practised by the papal legates and of the collation of benefices upon strangers; and these complaints found frequent expression in satires of the bitterest kind.[1]

The slanderous libels circulated against the Popes by the Emperor Frederic II. contributed still more to shake the veneration, confidence, and love of the people for the Holy See. These pamphlets contained, besides personal suspicions of certain Popes, the exposition of certain very pernicious principles, which in after times, particularly during the conflict between Louis the Bavarian and the Popes at Avignon, were presented in harsher colors, and not only upset the proper relationships between Pope and Emperor, but also called in question the undoubted ecclesiastical rights of the primate.[2]

The residence of the Popes at Avignon was a misfortune for the Church, chiefly because the Christian world at large saw in the Pope of Avignon more a friend of France than the supreme head cherishing for the whole Church a solicitude equal and common to all, and because the exactions of the curia, whose resources from the States of the Church had dried up, continually augmented the ill-will of the people.

But the Western schism, that poisonous fruit of the exile of Avignon, was even yet more injurious to the status and dignity of the Apostolic See. The mere fact that the Popes in Rome and the schismatics in Avignon had to seek recognition from the temporal princes, and that, in order not to lose their favor, they were compelled to ignore many things, threw too great an influence in ecclesiastical matters into the hands of the laity, which was very detrimental to church discipline.

To this may be added that the churches were now still more heavily taxed for the support of the two curias; and the mutual anathematizing of each other produced a contempt for the censures of the Church. Again, the bishoprics and prelatures were conferred neither according to merit nor to canonical rule, but often at the recommendation of some worldly prince, or with the view of

[1] On the complaints of the English envoys at the First Council of Lyons, 1245. see *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, v. 902, 999.

[2] See §§ 121, 124.

Digitized by Google

gaining a powerful ally or of rewarding some one for service performed. In this way the service of the Church underwent considerable detriment, and suffered many disadvantages in consequence.

Worse than this, not only the avowed enemies of the Apostolic See, but even well-disposed men, such as Henry of Langenstein, Peter D'Ailly, Nicholas of Clemange, Gerson, Nicholas of Cusa, and others, in the expressed intention of restoring ecclesiastical unity, propounded and defended views on the relation of the Pope to temporal princes and concerning his position in the Church which were erroneous in themselves and pernicious in their effects. The so-called reformatory synods of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, in seeking to reduce these principles to practice, had the hardihood to depose Popes, to pass new decrees on their rights and duties, whereby they greatly impaired the reverence due to the chair of St. Peter, called forth an indescribable confusion in Christendom, aroused the spirit of revolt against authority, while at the same time they made manifest the utter absurdity and destructive nature of such theories.

Notwithstanding all these foregoing difficulties, had the Popes acted with the energy and in the spirit of Gregory VII., they might have diverted great evils from the Church; had they set themselves in opposition to the corruption that pervaded all classes, from the clergy to the laity, and from the lowest class of these latter to the ranks of princes, including some members of the sacred college itself, much good might have been effected. But the watchmen on the walls of Sion were asleep, while the enemy was undermining the foundation. Some Popes indeed were aware of the mischief effected, but did not venture to enter on the gigantic struggle, and contented themselves with lopping off some obtrusive branches; and when nepotism had introduced into the college of cardinals a larger number of useless and often unworthy members, who in conclave were more intent on seeking their own advantage than on meeting and providing for the necessities of the Church, then the worldly spirit of the Renaissance and of the Humanists obtained the upper hand and prevailed in the Eternal City. Luxury, senseless prodigality, thoughtless squandering of time, superseded apostolic simplicity, dignity, and watchfulness over self, and hastened the breaking out of that catastrophe which, under the pretext of reformation, tore away by fraud or force many thousands of souls from the Church. But God had already chosen the men who were to work for the spiritual regeneration of all classes, and by their

Digitized by Google

labors at the Council of Trent to effect a thorough reformation of the Church in its head and in its members.

On the "Corpus juris canonici" and the literature concerning it, see the manuals of canon law. The first part of it contains the collection of canons and decrees composed by the monk Gratian, a professor at Bologna, 1150 or 1151. They are interpreted and applied in certain cases ("distinctiones," "causae," "de consecratione"). The "Glossa ordinaria" was composed by John Semeca (*Teutonicus*, + before 1240), Provost at Halberstadt. The second part comprehends the collection of decretals, "Decretalium Greg. IX.," lib. 5 ("judex," "judicium," "clerus," "connubia," "crimen"), composed in 1230 at the behest of Gregory IX. by St. Raymond of Pennaforte from the already existing five compilations, and the collection "Liber sextus" (containing the decrees of Innocent IV. and Boniface VIII.), added by Boniface VIII. himself in 1297, and likewise divided into five books. The third part consists of the so-called Clementines (Const. Clementinae, lib. 5), which were collected by Clement V. after the Council of Vienne, but were not published until 1317 under John XXII.; and of the so-called Extravagants (Extrav. communes and 20 Extr. Joh. XXII.), which were not edited as an authentic collection, and were received for the first time by John Chappuis in his edition of the Corp. jur. can. (Paris, 1499). In 1598 Pope Clement ordered Cardinal Pinelli to compose a "Liber septimus" (ed. *Sentis*. Friburg. 1870), but he did not confirm the collection.

§ 131. *The Other Members of the Hierarchy.*

The cardinals, to whom, by the decrees of Nicholas II., of Alexander III., of Gregory X., and others, was conceded the exclusive right of electing a Pope, were the counsellors of the Popes, and assisted them in the government of the Church. According to the regulations of the Church, only learned and able men, selected from the Christian world at large, should be received into the college of cardinals; unhappily, this rule was violated at the time of the exile at Avignon, and at a later period, by the nepotism of several Popes. The number of cardinals was not always equally large; the Synod of Basle wished to reduce it to twenty-four.

By the Fourth Council of the Lateran (c. 24), the cathedral chapters were granted the right of electing the bishop, which right, however, was limited, and sometimes even nullified, by papal reservations and by the temporal power. The chapters were to a considerable extent independent of the bishops, and had their own statutes. The number of their members was in most cases precisely determined. In several cathedral and collegiate chapters only the

Digitized by Google

sons of noble families could obtain canonicates or prebends; as, for example, in the cathedral chapters of Liege, 1145, were numbered nine sons of kings, fourteen sons of dukes, thirty counts, seven barons and knights. This arrangement, though not unjustifiable in itself, was prejudicial to Church discipline, when the rich foundations began to be considered as institutions for providing support for the younger sons of the nobility. In this way many talented men were excluded from the most important positions, and seeds of great dissension were sown between the nobles and non-nobles of the land. Another evil was the accumulation of benefices ("cumulatio beneficiorum"), some canons possessing the benefices of several churches. The Popes frequently nominated as members of these chapters deserving ecclesiastics, who were not of noble birth; but the noble-born were opposed to this. After the dissolution of the "vita communis," which in many dioceses continued to exist up to the thirteenth century, the cathedral vicars were appointed to celebrate the divine services.

In the thirteenth century, besides archdeacons, episcopal vicars-general, officials, and penitentiaries were appointed. The latter were the bishop's representatives "in foro interno." Auxiliary or titular bishops performed the episcopal functions when the diocesan bishop was prevented from doing so.

The tithes and the stole-fees ("jura stolae") served for the maintenance of the parish clergy. In many places the income of the clergy was very small. Many of the clergy lived on the stipends for masses (annuals), or pursued some trade; others filled the office of notary or of physician, etc; not a few lived on the alms of the faithful. To protect the revenues of the parish clergymen from the encroachments of the monks, it was found necessary for the Church to issue a series of laws.

The practice that prevailed of conferring a prebend before the recipient had been ordained was very injurious to the Church; still more so was the giving away of benefices and prebends to immature youths and boys, as also the heaping of several bishoprics and prebends (or canonries) on one individual, in violation of the ancient canonical laws. In this manner many dioceses obtained chief pastors who were ignorant of the language spoken by the natives, and who hardly visited their flocks even in a very hasty manner. Besides this, the rights of bishops in appointing clerics to parishes were often violated by patrons of the livings. Moreover, the real holders of the benefice often confided to poorly paid vicars the

Digitized by Google

performance of their functions. To do away with such abuses as these, the Church ordered that a perpetual vicar ("vicarius perpetuus") should be appointed, and that the real holder of the benefice, who was the proper pastor, should leave him a sufficiency for his maintenance from his revenues.

2. Religious Orders.

§ 132. *Religious Orders of Knights* (*Military Orders*).

The profound religious sentiment of the Middle Ages is evinced in a peculiarly illustrious manner by the numerous orders and congregations that took their rise about that time, each of which, while pursuing its own particular object, still kept in view the main object, the sanctification of their own members and of the world.

Beyond all other associations, those orders which combined knighthood with monasticism demand our special attention. Amongst these were the Knights of St. John, who owe their origin to a hospital in Jerusalem founded (1048) by some merchants of Amalfi. At first they occupied themselves with tending the sick; but, already under their second grand-master, Raymond du Puy, they took upon themselves the defence of the Holy Land and the protection of Christian pilgrims. Pope Innocent II. approved this change in their rule, and permitted the Hospitaller Brothers of St. John the Baptist, as they were first called, to wear a white cross, of Maltese form, on their breast; and the whole order now divided itself into knights, chaplains, and serving-brothers.

The Knights, who were greatly in favor alike with the Popes as with temporal rulers, on the conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin, 1187, chose the fortress Margat in Phœnicia as the head-quarters of their order; and after the fall of Acre, in 1285, they changed this to the island of Rhodes (1310). When this island in 1522 had fallen into the hands of the Turks under Soliman II., the Emperor Charles V. assigned, in 1530, the island of Malta to the Knights; and here they remained, in faithful observance of their rule, until the year 1798, when this bulwark was surrendered to General Bonaparte, it is said by the treason of the Grand-master the Count of Hompesch and of the French Knights.

The Peace of Amiens purposed to restore Malta to the order; but the English, who had wrested the island from the French,

Digitized by Google

refused to give it up; and the Peace of Paris, 1814, left them in peaceable possession of it.

At the head of the whole order, which was divided into nations or tongues, stood the grand-master; the chiefs of the respective nations were called "ballivi conventuales" or pillars ("piliers"). There were also female cloisters of this order. The order now chiefly attends to nursing the sick and wounded, as was especially seen in the time of the war of 1870–1871.

A similar association was that of the Templars, which was founded by nine French knights, who, under the leadership of Hugh of Payens (de Paganis) and Geoffrey of St. Omer, banded together for the protection of Christian pilgrims. This little society, who lived in great poverty, remained for a considerable time unnoticed, until, at the instance of St. Bernard, in 1127, the Council of Troyes gave them a rule which Pope Honorius II. confirmed. From that time forward the order was richly endowed with privileges and donations. The number of its members increased, and they fought bravely against the infidels. They wore a white mantle, with a red cross of eight points, of the Maltese form, on the shoulder. When Acre had fallen into the hands of the enemy, they withdrew to Cyprus and at a later date to the West. Paris became the central point of the order (Le Temple).

King Philip IV. of France was an inveterate enemy of the order; he worked upon the "apostolic solicitude" of Pope Clement V. till he induced him to abolish it in 1312.

Whether the crimes laid to the charge of the members of this order are wholly invented, or true at least in part, cannot be positively ascertained.

Alike celebrated with the Knights of St. John and the Knights Templars were the Teutonic Knights of St. Mary of Jerusalem, who made their appearance for the first time as an association at the siege of Acre, 1190. Henry Walpot of Bassenheim was their first grand-master. The habit of the order was white with a black cross. Pope Clement III. and the Emperor Henry VI. recognized the new order; and Pope Celestine III. approved their statutes, which were drawn from the rules of the St. John and Templar orders.

This order, which enjoyed the same privileges as the other two had, gained great credit for itself in the Church by subjugating the heathenish Prussians. After subduing this country, the grand-master removed from Venice, where he had resided since the fall of Acre, to Marienburg, on the Vistula, 1309, and thence, on the

Digitized by Google

apostasy of Albert of Brandenburg, to Mergentheim, in Suabia, 1525. In the year 1809 the grand-master lost his rank as prince. The present grand-master is Archduke William of Austria.

The other military orders — as that of the Brothers of the Sword, that of the Knights of Dobrin, those of St. Jago, Calatrava, and Alcantara of Spain, of Avis in Portugal, and of St. Maurice in Savoy — were of less significance than the preceding ones.

Although no certain judgment can be passed on the guilt or innocence of the Templars, the following has at least its foundation in history : —

I. The principal enemy of the order was Philip IV., who, on the denunciation of a certain *Squin v. Flexian*, demanded its suppression of Clement V. As the Pope did not immediately acquiesce in this demand, the king, on the 13th of October, 1307, had all the Templars in his dominions arrested, and prosecuted by the Grand-inquisitor William of Paris, Nogaret, and others. Being put to the torture and examined by other means also, confessions were extorted from the prisoners, which most of them afterwards revoked, even though such revocations exposed them to certain death, while pardon awaited those who stood by their confession.

Testimony equally in favor of the Templars is afforded by the unworthy proceedings of King Philip, who through his agent Dubois had pamphlets composed in which the Pope is accused of having been bribed by the Templars, and the king is called up to punish the impious, as Moses did of yore, without troubling himself about the Pope (Notices et extraits, xx. 2, p. 175 sqq.). This testimony is further advanced by the king's convoking a national assembly at Tours, May 1, 1308 (l. c. p. 163 sqq.), in order to give force to his threats against Clement, although the latter had already, Nov. 22, 1307, issued the bull " Pastoralis praeeminentiae," in which he had ordered the arrest of all the Templars and an examination to be made respecting them.

Besides this, it must create an unfavorable impression concerning Philip, that he, in violation of the agreement previously entered into with the Pope, and contrary to the ecclesiastical laws, cited the proceedings of examination before his own tribunal (*Boutaric*, La France sous Ph. le Bel, p. 132), and that afterwards, though he appeared to yield, he did not leave either the conduct of the prosecution of the Templars or that of the administration of their sequestrated property in France to the Pope, but by his management they practically adverted to himself, which can only be explained by the suggestion that the king was actuated by other motives than those which arose from his conviction of the guilt of the order.

Nay, the very crimes of which the order were accused, such as apostasy, idolatry and immorality, bear on their front the stamp of calumny, as such could scarcely have so long remained unknown had they been widely spread within the order.

This argument is strengthened by the fact that in the examinations entered

Digitized by Google

into in other countries by order of the Pope, the result for the most part testified to the innocence of the accused.

Finally, the conduct of Philip himself after the suppression of the order, more especially his exactions of money from the property of the Templars, with his refusal to hand over their possessions to the Knights of St. John, as he had promised to do, plainly reveal the motives that prompted him to persecute the order whose richest possessions were in France. Moreover, outside of their great riches and power (there were fifteen thousand Knights), the king's sentiments were influenced by the fact that in his contest with Boniface VIII. the Templars had sided with the Pope against himself.

II. Nor can the guilt of the members be inferred from the suppression of the order by the Pope; for as the bull of March 22, 1312, bears witness, that suppression took place without the accused being allowed to defend themselves as Clement V. and the majority of the Fathers wished. It took place, not in virtue of a legal sentence, but out of "apostolic solicitude." This important passage runs thus: "Non sine cordis amaritudine et dolore, *non per modum definitivae sententiae, sed per modum provisionis seu ordinationis apostolicae* praefatum templi ordinem et ejus statum, habitum atque nomen irrefragabili et perpetuo valitura tollimus sanctione ac perpetuae prohibitioni subjicimus, sacro concilio approbante, districtius inhibentes, ne quis dictum ordinem de cetero intrare, vel ejus habitum suscipere vel portare, aut pro templario gerere se praesumat." The same is expressed by the bull "Ad certitudinem," May 6, 1312. In it Clement reserves to himself the sentence to be passed on several members of the order, particularly on the grand-master, James of Molay, and others, whilst the rest of them are referred for judgment to the provincial synods; and on these synods the Pope enjoined care for the innocent, and clemency towards all. By the bull of May 2, "Ad providam," the Pope regulates the disposal of the property of the order.

Furthermore, it is not to be overlooked that Philip IV. appeared in Vienne at the head of an armed force to carry out the suppression of the order, which to him was an object of hatred; and that he, disregarding the commission appointed by Clement, ordered the grand-master and the grand-preceptor of Normandy to be burnt, after both the accused had decidedly refused to plead guilty to the crimes confessed by them when under torture, as the members of the commission wished them to do, — in the face of death they solemnly protested the innocence of the order.

Although these facts are strong witnesses in disproof of the accusations brought against the Order of Templars, they do not altogether confute them. At a later period some men have undertaken to defend the order, whose reasonings have rather tended to establish than to remove an unfavorable judgment.

On the whole question see *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vol. vi.

Digitized by Google

§ 133. *The New Monastic Orders founded on the Rule of St. Benedict and St. Augustine.*

These were: 1. The Order of Grammont (Grand mont). Its founder was Stephen of Tigerno, in Auvergne, who by his residence at the court of Archbishop Milo of Benevento, and by his intercourse with the austere hermits of Calabria, had come to the conclusion that he would found an order of the strictest poverty. Gregory VII. gave his special approbation to the plan (1073); and Stephen, who died in 1124, built his first cloister at Muret, near Limoges. The inmates of this cloister withdrew to Grandmont under Peter of Limoges, their second superior. It was under the fourth prior, Stephen of Lisiac, that the "Consuetudines" were selected for a rule. Grandmont continued to be the principal seat of the order; the presidents of other separate cloisters were called "correctores." Unhappily, the arrogance displayed by the lay-brothers ("conversi"), to whom had been intrusted the administration of the temporal affairs, gave rise to schisms within the order, which were injurious to its spirit; on which account the Apostolic See was frequently obliged to interfere. John XXII. raised Grandmont to the rank of an abbey, to which the other thirty-nine priories were subordinated. This order ceased at the French Revolution.

2. The Order of the Carthusians. This order owes its origin to St. Bruno of Cologne,[1] afterwards master of the cathedral school at Rheims, who in 1086 laid the foundation of the mother-cloister of this order in a frightfully desolate valley called La Chartreuse, in the diocese of Grenoble. Invited thither by his former pupil, Pope Urban II., Bruno went (1090) to Rome, thence to Calabria, where he founded a second monastery, in which he ended his days in 1101. The strict rules of the order were drawn up in writing by Guigo, the fifth prior. The monks led a contemplative life; but they also cultivated the soil, and distinguished themselves in learned pursuits. The Prior of Chartreuse stood at the head of all the monasteries of the order. The original simplicity in these monasteries vanished as riches increased; nevertheless, the old strictness of discipline was retained. The order of "vallis caulium"

[1] Respecting the appalling legend of his deceased teacher at the Parisian High-School, the authenticity of which is defended by Don Ducreux, a Carthusian priest, see *Tappert*, St. Bruno, Luxembourg, 1872, p. 374 sqq.

Digitized by Google

is a special branch of this order. There were but few female convents belonging to it.

3. The Order of Cistercians, or Bernardines. The Benedictine monk, Robert, Abbot of Molesme (+ 1108), is venerated by the members of this order as their spiritual father. He, discontented with his own monks, founded a monastery at Citeaux (Cistercium), in the bishopric of Châlons-sur-Marne. In the first years of its existence it numbered but few members; but after St. Bernard with his thirty associates had entered (1113), its numbers increased so rapidly that in a short time four new monasteries had to be founded. Of these, the most celebrated was Clairvaux (Clara vallis).

The Abbot of Citeaux was the head of this order; his council consisted of the abbots of the first four monasteries. The rule of the order ("Charta caritatis," 1119) is the reformed Benedictine Rule. The monks practised manual labor, without, however, neglecting study. During the Middle Ages the Cistercian abbots were held in high veneration, and were employed in important missions. This order also had female cloisters.

4. The Premonstratensians, or Norbertines, were in the beginning regular canonists, who united the contemplative to the active life. Their founder is St. Norbert, a descendant of the noble house of Van Gennep in Xanten, who had not put to the best possible use the revenues which he derived from several ecclesiastical prebends, until, being one day struck by lightning and rescued from death, he (1114) suddenly changed his course of life, distributed his goods to feed the poor, labored with astonishing success as a preacher of penance in several countries, and founded at Prémontré (Pratum monstratum) the first monastery of his order, which was confirmed by Honorius II. (1126). Yet in the same year Norbert, being present at the Diet of Spire, was there elected Archbishop of Magdeburg, as if by inspiration. It was with reluctance that he accepted the proffered dignity; he made his appearance in his episcopal city in the garb of poverty, and encountered many difficulties in the fulfilment of his office; eventually he reaped splendid fruits from his labors. The rule of this order is similar to that called after St. Augustine; there were cloisters of monks and nuns. The tertiaries of this order lived in the world.

5. The Celestinian and Augustinian Hermits. The founder of the first order is Peter of Murone, who ascended the papal chair under the name of Celestine V. Urban IV., in 1264, gave the monks the Benedictine Rule. The director of the whole order since the year

Digitized by Google

1284 has been the Abbot of Sulmona. The Augustinian Hermits took their rise from an amalgamation of various religious associations by Pope Alexander IV. (1256). They venerate St. Augustine as their spiritual father, having received his rule from the Apostolic See. The rule did not, however, originate with St. Augustine in its present form.

§ 134. *The Orders devoted to the Special Veneration of Mary.*

1. The Order of Fontevrault (Fons Ebraldi), founded by the great preacher of penance Robert of Arbrissel (1094), and confirmed by Paschal II. There were cloisters for men and women, both of which were subject to the Abbess of Fontevrault. They followed the Benedictine Rule. The members of the order had the difficult vocation of converting fallen women and girls.

2. The Order of the Guilbertines, which had a similar constitution to that of Fontevrault. It was founded by St. Guilbert of Sempingham, and confirmed by Pope Eugene III.

3. The Order of the Carmelites. Its founder was Berthold, a monk and priest of Calabria, who in the year 1156, with a few companions, led a hermit life on Mount Carmel. Albert, Patriarch of Jerusalem, in 1219 gave the Anchorites of Mount Carmel a rule which Honorius confirmed in 1224. Driven from Mount Carmel by the Saracens, the hermits came to Europe, where their numbers rapidly increased as cenobites, and they were classed among the Mendicant Orders (1245). Under Pope Eugene IV. (1431) the members were divided into "calceati" (shod), or conventuals, and "discalceati" (unshod), or observants. They had cloisters for monks and nuns. Tertiaries have also joined the order since 1477. In 1697 Pope Innocent XII. put an end to a controversy respecting the age of the order. The sixth general, Simon Stock, an Englishman, introduced the scapular.[1]

4. The Servites (Servi B. M. V.), an order founded by seven noble youths of Florence, with the consent of Archbishop Ardinghus, 1233, and approved by Alexander IV., 1255. St. Philip Benitius (+ 1285), the general and ornament of the order, also received tertiaries. The order also cultivated learning.

5. The Olivetans, or brethren of St. Mary of Mount Olivet. Their founder is John Tolomei, of Siena (1319). They had the

[1] Cf. *Launoi*, Diss. 5 de Simon. Stokii viso, de Sabbatinae bullae privileg. et scapularis Carmelitar, sodalitate (Op. om. ii. p. 2, p. 379).

Digitized by Google

Benedictine Rule. John XXII. confirmed the order. The Institute of Oblates at Rome, founded by St. Francisca Romana (+ 1440), is a branch of this order; it was confirmed by Eugene IV.

The Nolasci, information concerning which will be given in the following sections, belong to this division.

§ 135. *Orders founded expressly for taking Care of the Sick and for other Objects of Charity.*

1. The devastating epidemics by which the people in the Middle Ages were frequently visited called into life several religious orders, the members of which devoted themselves to the care of the sick. Of this description were: —

a. The Anthonists, at first a society of laymen, on whom Honorius III. in 1218 conferred the rights and privileges of an order, and to whom Boniface VIII. in 1297 gave the Augustinian Rule. Its founder was the French nobleman Gaston, whose son had, at the intercession of St. Anthony of Egypt, recovered from a pestilential disease, the so-called Sacred Fire (1095). The chief monastery of this order was at St. Didier-la-Mothe, where St. Anthony was particularly venerated.

b. The Hospitallers, founded by Guido of Montpellier and approved by Pope Innocent III., in 1198. The members of this order, who to the three vows added the fourth, "to serve their masters the poor," from the time of Eugene IV. observed the Augustinian Rule. Their principal monastery was the Hospital of the Holy Ghost at Rome.

c. The Cellites, since 1348 also called Alexians, from the name of their patron saint, Alexius. Pope Pius II. gave them the Augustinian Rule in 1460.

d. The Jesuates, originally an association of laymen founded by John Columbini of Siena, and recognized by Pope Urban V. in 1364 as an order of the Augustinian Rule. Clement IX. in 1668 abolished the monks' cloisters, which had become degenerated. The nuns' convents of this order, however, in which the rule was strictly observed, are still in existence.

2. It was no small benefit that was rendered to suffering humanity by the orders whose object it was to free Christian slaves from the hands of the Saracens: these were, —

a. The Nolasci, or the Order of Our Lady for the Liberation of Captives, founded in 1218 by St. Peter Nolascus, assisted by St. Raymond of Pennaforte, a Dominican, and James, King of Aragon.

Digitized by Google

They were originally divided into two classes, — knights and brothers (priests). Under Pope Clement V. the former joined the military orders; the brothers, however, whose reorganization by John Baptist Gonzales was confirmed by Clement VIII., remained faithful to their original vocation.

b. The Trinitarians of St. John of Matha and St. Felix of Valois. This order, which was confirmed by Innocent III., spread especially in Spain and France. In this latter kingdom they were also called Mathurins, from the church of St. Mathurin at Paris, where they had their first cloister. The principal monastery was that of Cerfroi, in the diocese of Meaux. At first the rule was strictly observed; later, tepidity seized upon the members. Yet reformatory attempts were made. They wore a white habit, with a blue and red cross on the breast. The order had cloisters for women, and received tertiaries.

3. Other religious associations of this epoch were, —

a. The Humiliati (Humbled), a society of laymen which came into existence in the time of the Emperor Henry II., and in 1134 was divided into male and female associations. St. John of Meda gave them the Benedictine Rule, and Pope Innocent III. granted them the rights of an order. In the year 1571, however, Pope Pius V. suppressed the monasteries of the monks on account of an attempt to murder St. Charles Borromeo, who had endeavored to introduce reforms.

b. The Beghines, or Beguines, a society of pious women and virgins, who dwelt in small houses, had religious services in common, and employed themselves in manual labor. This association arose in the twelfth century. Pope Urban III. confirmed their rule. Pope Clement V. intended to do away with it, but his successor John XXII. took them under his protection. There were also men's associations of this description, called Beghards;[1] these, however, soon fell into decay, and dissolved the community of their own accord.

c. The Hieronymites, who lived according to the Rule of St. Augustine, and venerated St. Jerome as their patron. This association was formed by several hermits combining to lead a community life. They spread in Spain; the celebrated cloisters of Our Lady of Guadeloupe in Estramadura, Escurial, and St. Just belonged to them. In Portugal they had establishments at Belem and Mafra. In Italy the community was introduced by Peter Gambacorti (Petrus de Pisis). In 1374 Pope Gregory XI. gave them a rule.

[1] See § 145. *Mosheim*, De Beghardis et Beguinabus ed. *Martini*. Leips. 1790.

Digitized by Google

d. The Order of the Minims was founded by St. Francis of Paula (+ 1507), and confirmed by Sixtus IV. (1474).

e. The Order of St. Bridget of Sweden (+ 1373), or of the Savior, is very similar to the Order of Fontevrault.

4. Towards the end of this epoch several religious societies arose in Germany and in the Netherlands, the members of which led a life in common. Gerard Groot of Deventer (+ 1384) founded an association of clerics under the name of Clergy and Brethren of the Common Life ("Clerici et fratres vitae communis"). His pupil Florentius Radewin (+ 1400) continued the work. Laymen also joined the community.

The monastery of the canons regular at Windesheim (1386) formed a central point for the various confraternities. Another cloister stood on Mount St. Agnes, near Zwoll. Being favored by the Popes Eugene IV. and Paul II., these confraternities encouraged study, successfully opposed the demoralization of the clergy and laity, and were in many other respects solicitous and energetic in promoting the welfare of the Church and of mankind. Thomas à Kempis and Gabriel Biel, the last of the Sententiaries, belonged to them.

§ 136. *The two great Mendicant Orders.*

More important and more influential than any of the orders of this epoch which we have hitherto considered, were the orders of St. Dominic and of St. Francis of Assisi, which arose in the thirteenth century.

Without being able to decide on entering the profession of a merchant, St. Francis, who combined a deep sense of religion with an intense love for the poor, and who was of a cheerful disposition, spent the days of his youth at his father's house, which, when he clearly saw his vocation, he abandoned, in order to devote himself entirely to the service of God. Having disarmed the opposition of his father by renouncing his inheritance, he commenced his career as a preacher of penance, and in a short time attracted to himself so many young men of every rank of life, who were willing to follow his austere manner of living, that he resolved to found a new order.

Pope Innocent III. (1210) assented to the design, and gave his verbal approval to the association of the Friars Minor ("Fratres minores"), or Minorites. The formal sanction of the rule,[1] however,

[1] *Holstein-Brokie*, tom. iii. p. 21 sqq.

Digitized by Google

was not given until 1223 by Pope Honorius III. Its principal object is the realization of a poverty so perfect that it should be manifested in every way and in all things.

About the same time (1212) St. Clara of Assisi associated herself with several pious virgins in order to lead a cloistered life. St. Francis gave them a rule. They are known now by the name of the Poor Clares. He also induced people living in the world to join the two orders as tertiaries.

Not content with having done so much for the honor of God in the West. the saint undertook the wearisome and hazardous task of preaching the Christian faith to Mahometans. He even preached before the Sultan of Egypt, without however converting him to Christianity. In Palestine he left his pupil to guard the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem.

Even in this world God glorified his servant by imprinting on his person the marks of the five wounds ("Stigmata")[1] in 1224; two years after which he became a participator in the glories of heaven. His utter surrender of his whole being to God, which is expressed so forcibly in his divinely inspired hymns, enabled him to enter into those relations with Nature which mankind held before the fall. As early as 1228 Gregory IX. canonized this wonderful man, who has been a source of blessing for the human race.

Simultaneously with St. Francis, St. Dominic, born at Calahorra, in Old Castile, 1170, labored for the same intent. He was the founder of the Order of the Friars Preachers. He completed his theological studies at Valencia, became canon in 1199, and subsequently subprior, at Osma.

The atrocities committed by the Albigenses in the south of France, whither Dominic had accompanied his bishop, Diego, made him embrace the resolution to devote his whole life to the conversion of those who had gone astray. His sermons were very effective; and as early as the year 1206 he was enabled to found the convent La Prouille, in the diocese of Toulouse, for the reception of converted women, and for the education of poor girls from the higher classes.

But in order to combat heresy persistently, the zealous missionary founded, in 1215, the Order of Friars Preachers ("Fratres praedicatores"), to whom, at the desire of Pope Innocent III., he gave a somewhat modified Augustinian Rule.[2] The first monastery of the

[1] Cf. *Bonaven.* Legenda major. c. 13.

[2] The Fourth Council of the Lateran had (c. 13) ordained: "Ne nimia religionum

Digitized by Google

new order to which Honorius III. gave ecclesiastical sanction was built at Toulouse, and the first general chapter was held at Bologna, 1220. It was here determined that the habit should be white, and that the order should possess no property. A year later, Aug. 6, 1221, Dominic ended his earthly career in the above-named city. In 1234 Gregory IX. placed him among the saints.

Like the Order of the Minorites, that of the Dominicans had cloisters for women, and Tertiaries, the so-called militia of Christ ("Ordo militiae Christi"). The Pope conferred on Dominic the dignity of a Master of the Sacred Palace ("Magister sacri Palatii"), and made him chief of the staff of book-censors, — an office which continued in the order. St. Dominic also gave the present form to the Rosary.

The interior constitutions of the Minorites and of the Dominicans are very similar. At the head of each convent, the former place a guardian, the latter a prior. For each single province a "prior provincialis" is appointed. The supreme government of each order is vested in the general ("minister generalis"), who resides in Rome. Important matters are decided in provincial and general chapters. Four definers ("definitores") assist the provincial and general.

§ 137. *Efficiency of these Orders. — The Enmity they excited. — Disputes and Party-Divisions among Themselves.*

In order to apprehend the significance of the two Mendicant Orders, the ecclesiastical and political condition of the thirteenth century must be taken into consideration.

Instead of the early enthusiasm for the Church, many Christians had become envious of and averse to the rich (?) clergy, who, on their part being somewhat worldly-minded, no longer possessed the force to remove this mistrust on the side of the laity, nor efficiently to counteract the tepidity and corruption which were making daily inroads among them.

It was to these discontented dispositions that the preachers or orators of the new sects arising on all sides addressed themselves; when, under the hypocritical mask of zeal for the restoration of the

diversitas gravem in ecclesia Dei confusionem inducat, firmiter prohibemus, nequis de caetero novam religionem inveniat; sed quicunque voluerit ad religionem converti, unam de approbatis assumat." Dominic adopted several decisions of the Premonstratensians into his rule.

Digitized by Google

primitive purity and simplicity of the Church, they endeavored to mislead the unsuspecting minds of the people to the adoption of their shameless blasphemies.

The dangers alike to spiritual and to temporal power which arose from this cause were ever on the increase. The demonstrations made by the opponents of religion and of the State became bolder and bolder; it was an evil that would not yield either to the force of arms, to ecclesiastical censures, or to all the labors of such religious orders, then existent, as could be brought to bear upon it.[1]

It was then that the Mendicant monks suddenly arose; they travelled through cities and villages, they instructed the faithful, they victoriously rebutted heresy, and in this way they protected Europe from the anarchy which was advancing towards her with giant strides. Neither was it of less importance to the Church that these orders preached the Gospel to the heathen, and labored with unremitting zeal to effect the reunion of the schismatic Greeks with the Church; that they converted many who had been led astray, and many heretics; that they regenerated the clergy alike with the people; that they reconciled enemies; and that they were intrusted, not alone by the Popes, but also by temporal rulers, with missions of the most difficult description and of the highest importance.

The achievements of the two orders in reference to learning and knowledge were scarcely less considerable. The greatest doctors, the ornaments of the universities, — such men as Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, and others, — belonged to these orders.[2]

This unlooked-for and immeasurable influence of the Mendicant Orders on their contemporaries called forth the opposition of a portion of the secular clergy and of the professors of the university. This opposition was in part occasioned by the imprudent conduct and encroachments of some of the monks.

The most violent of the assailants of the efficiency and of the religious institution of Mendicants was William de St. Amour (de Sancto Amore), Professor of Paris. St. Thomas Aquinas[3] replied to his unfounded and exaggerated accusations. He and St. Bonaven-

[1] See § 146.

[2] See §§ 110, 121, 139, 141. *Wadding*, Annales Minorum, 8 vols. fol. Lugd. 1625 sqq.; *Mamachi*, Annales ordinis predicatorum, Monumenta Franciscana, ed. Brewer and Hewlett, Lond. 1858 and 1882, 2 vols., treat of the English province.

[3] Contra retrahentes homines ab ingressu religionis, and Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem, printed in the Opuscula of St. Thomas.

Digitized by Google

ture[1] composed glorious apologies for their respective orders, to oppose to these calumnies.

The controversies on doctrine and other matters which broke out between the Dominicans and the Minorites were even more detrimental to the prosperity of the two orders than had been this enmity of opponents; and the divisions which took place among the latter were more injurious yet.

In order to preserve unity and mutual love among the members of both orders, the two generals issued in the year 1255, a beautiful united rescript, in which they dwelt on the exalted significance of these two virtues as a means of insuring the duration and of calling down a blessing on the labors of the brethren.

The danger incurred under Elias of Cortona, the second general of the Minorites, and under Crescentius of Essi, of yielding to too great laxity of discipline, was happily warded off by the more fervent party under the guidance of St. Anthony of Padua (+ 1231).[2]

More to be lamented than even this contest, was the controversy on the rule of the order, especially as it regarded the vow of poverty.[3] To put an end to it, Pope Nicholas III., in 1279, issued the bull "Exiit, qui seminat,"[4] by which he declared the rule of the order to be in conformity with the Gospel, and reserved, as Innocent IV. had already done, all the property, whether houses, lands, gardens, or movables used by the order, as belonging to the Holy See.

This decretal did not attain its end. Some zealots in the order now maintained that according to the decision of the Pope the rule of the order was truly and *properly* the Gospel itself, and as such unchangeable; and that poverty consisted in the *perfect* renunciation of every *possession* and *right of use*, even regarding the things to be consumed, as food and the like, so that only the most simple use ("simplicissimus usus") remained to the friars. These zealots for absolute poverty (Spiritualists) were, some of them at least, eccentric enthusiasts, who finally placed themselves in formal

[1] Expositio in regulam fratrum minorum. Lib. apolog. in eos, qui ordini Minor. adversantur. De paupertate Christi contra Guil. Op. scti Bonav., tom. vii. Lugd. 1668.

[2] Notwithstanding such difficulties, the first century of the Franciscan order was one of wonderful increase and prosperity, in which the severity of the order and the observance of the Rule were maintained.

[3] *Regula scti Franc.* c. 6: "Fratres nihil approprient nec domum nec locum nec aliquam rem, sed tanquam peregrini et advenae in hoc saeculo in paupertate et humilitate Deo famulantes vadant pro eleemosyna confidenter."

[4] Bull "Exiit, qui seminat," in c. 3, De verbi signific. in vi. (v. 12). On the controversies, see *Wadding*, Annal. Minor., in which the papal bulls are also printed.

Digitized by Google

opposition to the Holy See, and established connections with the heretical Fratricelli, or Beghards.

The opposition[1] of the Spiritualists to the Apostolic See was chiefly shown in a writing of the Minorite Gerhard (1254), composed as an introduction to the so-called Everlasting Gospel of the Cistercian abbot, Joachim of Floris (+ 1202), containing the prophecies, and in the exposition of the Apocalypse by John of Oliva (+ 1297).

Pope Celestine V. made the attempt to restore peace to the order by exempting the Spiritualists from paying obedience to the general of the order; but Boniface VIII. soon saw himself obliged to withdraw the permission granted by his predecessor. The majority of them resisted the papal commands. To win over the schismatics, Pope Celestine V. in the bull "Exivi de paradiso" had given an explanation of the rule. His successor, John XXII., in the bull "Quorumdam exigit" also ordered the schismatics who had been guilty of great excesses to return to the obedience of their general. Instead of obeying, the schismatic Spiritualists threw off allegiance to the Pope himself, withdrew to Sicily, and elected Henry of Ceva as their general.

This conflict took a new phase under John XXII., and entered a more extensive field. The main object of contention which the Spiritualists shared with the Conventuals, their opponents, was whether it was heretical to say that Christ and his Apostles had possessed property, individually or in common. To render it possible to bring the question under fair discussion, the Pope retracted the censures of the bull "Exiit," and demanded opinions from the cardinals, from the Sorbonne, from the universities, and also from the Minorites, before proceeding to a decision. The general of the order, Michael of Cesena, Occam, and others declared, in the general chapter at Perugia, that it was not heretical to say that Christ and the Apostles had possessed no property. The Minorite Bonagratia brought this decision to Avignon.

In answer to this conclusion, the Pope, on Dec. 8, 1322, published the bull "Ad conditorem canonum," in which the property reserved by Nicholas III. to the Holy See was surrendered. The formal dogmatic decision respecting the property of Christ

[1] This opposition is by no means to be ascribed to the order as such. The *really heretical* views of Gerhard were not shared by any of the other members; he was, on account of his obstinacy, punished by his superiors.

Digitized by Google

and the Apostles ensued, on Nov. 12, 1323, in the bull "Cum inter nonnullos," in which the inflexible assertion that Christ and his Apostles had possessed no property, and no right of disposal or of using any, was condemned as contradictory to Holy Writ, and as undermining its authority;[1] on which accounts it was declared heretical. But the above-named disputants did not submit to this decision. They left the order, and joined Louis the Bavarian, whom they greatly assisted in the warfare he carried on against the Pope.

In the beginning of the fifteenth century the first great reform of the order took place, under the lead of St. Bernardinus and John Capistranus. The Council of Constance at length recognized both the "Fratres conventuales" and the "Fratres regularis (strictioris) observantiae." The former are sometimes called by the people "Black Franciscans" on account of their black habit; the latter are also called the Reformed (Reformati), or Recollects.

In conclusion, some general remarks on the religious orders of the Middle Ages may be useful.

1. All the founders of orders were saintly men who, being called by God in a miraculous manner, endowed by him with many personal graces, and by him animated with the divine fire of charity, laid the foundation of their order, the recognition and supreme supervision of which they, in all humility, committed to the decision of the Apostolic See.

2. The multiplicity of these religious associations by no means arises from inconstancy and caprice, but has its origin, on the one hand, in the various exigencies of humanity which called these orders into life, and, on the other hand, in the capabilities, the character, and the bent of individual men, which the Church would not deform by reducing them all to a lifeless uniformity, but rather seeks to transfigure and elevate them to a higher unity, by developing individual faculties. This it is which forms the peculiar efficiency of the orders, and preserves them from stagnation.

3. In order to sketch a picture of monastic life in few words, we here present Dante's description of Paradise (Parad. XXVII. 7, XXX. 37).

> I gazed! It seemed a universal smile
> Entranced the eye: e'en as that harmony
> Did heretofore th' enraptured ear beguile,
> Thrilling the soul with wondrous ecstasy!
> Life was all rapt in peace; and Love's warm glow
> Brought greater wealth than riches can bestow.
>
> . . . .
>
> Leader alike in gesture as in voice,
> Beatrice spoke: now are we come to Heaven,

[1] C. 4, De verb. signif. Extrav. Joh. XXII., tit. 14.

Digitized by Google

To Light embodied, pure, whence all rejoice;
Through which all sweetness of delight is given;
Love of eternal good: transcendent bliss! —
All other joys, all raptures, yield to this.

4. The means of enjoying this paradisiacal happiness on earth are the rules of the orders, which, with all their immaterial differences, are inspired by the spirit of a faithful imitation of the life of Jesus Christ, chiefly manifested in the observance of the evangelical counsels.

5. It is true, assuredly, that the life led in several monasteries did not always correspond to the ideal conception of the founder (cf. *Dante*, Parad. XXII. 76), and that complaints on the decline of monastic discipline come repeatedly from ecclesiastical superiors, and from other men and women enlightened by God, who at the same time put in force the strongest measures to do away with the abuses which had crept into the religious houses.

6. But this decline, which cannot be laid to the charge of all, nor applied to the whole order, was in no way occasioned by the interior organization of the order, but was brought about by the unlawful and too frequent intermeddling in monastic affairs of outsiders, and especially by the injurious practice called "commendam."

7. As, however, all decline had been occasioned by deviating from the letter, or from the spirit of the rule, so all the attempts at reform made in the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries consisted in inculcating and restoring the original rule, by various decrees of the synods on the dress and employment of monks and nuns, on the prayer in choir, on cloistral discipline, and particularly on the observance of the vow of poverty, and on participating in the care of souls, etc. (Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vols. vi., vii.)

8. The efforts to reform the Benedictine Order were very effective. In the year 1336 Pope Benedict XII. caused a constitution ("Benedictina") to be drawn up for the monks, according to which the order was divided into thirty-six provinces, and provincial chapters were to be held regularly every three years. The Council of Constance also occupied itself with the Benedictine Reform. The same object was pursued by the new congregations of St. Justina of Padua, afterwards, by order of Pope Julius II., called Congregatio Cassinensis, which attained importance in Spain (congregation of Valladolid) and in Germany (*Barbi*, Liber de initio et progressu congreg. Benedict. St. Justinae, etc., ap. *Pez.* Thesaur, anecdot. noviss. ii. 268 sqq.; *Tosti*, Storia della badia di Monte Casino, iii. 235 sqq.); and the celebrated congregation of Bursfeld, founded by Abbot John Dederoth in 1433, which spread throughout Germany (*Leuckfeld*, Antiquitates Bursfeld. Leips. 1713).

On monastic life and efficiency in the Middle Ages, see *Kenelm Digby*, Mores Catholici, vol. x.

Digitized by Google

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. The Achievements of Learning during this Epoch.

§ 138. *The Universities. — Scholasticism and Mysticism.*

The reawakening of the religious spirit by the reformatory measures taken by Gregory VII. produced a very gratifying result in the impetus which it gave to the elevation and progress of learning; and not a few of the cathedral and cloistral schools attained a high reputation for scholarship during the second half of the Middle Ages.[1]

The higher institutions of learning already existing received another accession by the foundation of new schools, and by the universities, which originated in the twelfth century, partly growing out of the cloistral schools, and partly taking their prominent position from the distinguished teachers who conducted their course.

They did not at once embrace the full curriculum of scientific studies. The so-called faculties are of later date; each university had its specialty, — at Paris, in 1206, it was theology; at Bologna, in 1200, it was jurisprudence; and at Salerno, medicine. The name "university" did not at first indicate universal knowledge, but a corporation or national union ("univ. nationum"). The constitution of the University of Paris was essentially aristocratic ("univ. magistrorum"); that of Bologna was democratic ("univ. scholarium"). The teaching institute was termed "schola" or "studium generale."

The numerous students, from every country, who frequented the high schools were divided according to their nationalities. At the head of the individual provinces stood the deans. The various nationalities had procurators, who elected the rector of the university.

The Popes bestowed a peculiar and special care on the higher institutions of learning, which in the Middle Ages were stamped with a specific ecclesiastical character. From the time of the thirteenth century the approval of the Pope was solicited before the

[1] Cf. §§ 98, 99.

[2] "Facultas-Disciplin." The course of discipline in vogue usually comprised Theology, Jurisprudence, Medicine, and Philosophy.

Digitized by Google

foundation of a university; but even previous to this, the older institutions of this description stood under the supervision of the Apostolic See, who exercised his right through the medium of his representative, the chancellor of the university.

The Popes proved their high regard for learning and knowledge, (1) By incorporating ecclesiastical benefices with the universities, thus providing for the maintenance of the professors; (2) By conferring great privileges on teachers and students; and (3) By rendering to these institutions of learning other and material aid which was far from insignificant. This predilection of the Apostolic See for the higher institutes of learning by no means hindered the Popes from forcibly opposing any excesses among the students, or from vigorously repelling any encroachments on the part of the professors.

Temporal princes imitated the example of ecclesiastical superiors, and in like manner conferred on the universities various revenues, rights, and privileges; still, their fundamental mainstay consisted in the property of the Church. The "Venia legendi," as well as the right of promotion, was also the gift of the Popes to the corporate body of professors. The conferring of degrees (Baccalaureus, Magister, Doctor) took place with religious ceremonies, often in the Church and at the hands of the bishop. An academical degree obtained at a university found recognition everywhere.

It was thus, by taking the freedom of learning under its own protection, and by hindering to the best of its power that the relations of teachers and students should be narrowed to the limitation of respective nationalities, that the splendor of the mediæval universities shone forth in such unexampled grandeur; before the year 1517 the number of these institutions in Europe was sixty-six, of which sixteen were in Germany. But, alas! this splendor grew pale in proportion as the State monopolized instruction, and converted these free corporate bodies into high schools of the State, making the frequenting of them a condition for holding office under that State.

In order to render the pursuit of knowledge easier for students of small means, colleges and purses were established. The oldest foundation of this kind was that of *Robert of Sorbonne,* Court Chaplain of Louis IX. in 1250.

As *theological* studies are more properly the subject of ecclesiastical history, they will form more exclusively the theme of our present discussion.

Digitized by Google

Mediæval theology is presented mainly under two different aspects, — the one speculative, the other contemplative, — *Scholasticism* and *Mysticism*. The object of scholastic theology is, (1) To demonstrate the interior connection of the several dogmas of faith, and thence deduce other truths; (2) To refute the objections of heretics; and (3) By means of human wisdom, to illuminate and strengthen the truths of faith.

Mystic theology[1] teaches the union of man with God by the extraordinary gifts of intuition.[2] It belongs to theoretic theology inasmuch as many mystics discussed, and brought more closely into connection with the teachings of faith, the conceptions or revelations of such intuitions.

Scholasticism and mysticism are therefore agreed in the principle whence they proceed; they are distinguished only by the manner in which they seek to learn the truths of faith. The scholastic considers the matter under dialectic forms; the mystic, by the way of intuition. Scholasticism is the way of discursive, mysticism of intuitive, thinking. There exists, then, no inimical opposition between these two modes of seeking truth; rather are they mutually dependent one on the other.

The entire distinction between scholastic and mystic theology resolves itself, chiefly, into the *way* and *manner* in which they obtained their results. A further difference exists in the *form*. The scholastic expresses himself in terse and concise terms, and especially favors syllogisms; the mystic, on the other hand, prefers to clothe his thoughts in figures. Finally, these two aims differ in their tendency. Scholasticism is pre-eminently speculative; mysticism is ever practical.

The reproaches made regarding scholasticism are mostly unfounded, especially the assertion that scholastics chiefly occupy themselves with useless subtleties; this is for the most part untrue. No less false and unfounded are the objections made to mysticism, — for these do not apply to true mysticism, which really distinguishes God from the world; but they may strike, and not unfairly, that false mysticism which emanates from the pantheistic dreamers alike of the Middle Ages as of these more modern times.

[1] Mysticism is derived from the Greek word μύειν, "to instruct in sacred things, to initiate;" thus referring to the interior life.

[2] "Vita purgativa, illuminativa et unitiva." Cf. Thom. II., ii. qu. 188, a. 5.

Digitized by Google

§ 139. *The first Times of Scholasticism.*

The speculative attempts of John of Damascus found imitators in the West, where, under the patronage of Charles the Bald in the ninth century, learning and science were in a flourishing condition. Yet the productions of individuals about this time were mere isolated essays, nay, were often viewed with suspicion; and this the more because the man who was the most devoted to this pursuit, John Scotus Erigena, had fallen into great errors.

It was towards the end of the eleventh century that speculative theology first became more cultivated; and it was Lanfranc, the great bishop of Canterbury, who has the merit of its revival.[1] Yet the actual founder of scholastic theology is St. Anselm, the pupil of Lanfranc. He was born at Aosta, in Piedmont, 1033. In the year 1078 he became the Abbot of Bec, in Normandy, — an abbey in which he had studied under Lanfranc, whom in 1093 he succeeded in the Archiepiscopal See of Canterbury. As Primate of England, he not only defended the rights of the Church, but also gained great renown as a learned man. He was a diligent student of the writings of St. Augustine.

Starting from the principle "Fides quaerit intellectum,"[2] or "Credo ut intelligam," the holy doctor endeavors in his most interesting writings to explain and defend Christian dogma. The most important and influential of his works is his "Cur Deus homo," in which he adduces reasons for the incarnation of the Son of God. In his work "Proslogium" or "Fides quaerens intellectum," he deduced the existence of God from the so-called ontological argument,[3] — that such existence is proved by the fact that the human mind has an idea of a Being infinitely supreme, than whom no higher can be imagined or conceived of. This argument was assailed by the monk Gaunillo of Marmoutiers.

The celebrated doctor also took part in the learned disputations of the times, especially in the controversy which again broke out in

[1] Cf. §§ 98–100, 103, 104.

[2] "Sicut rectus ordo exigit, ut profunda Christianae fidei credamus, priusquam ea praesumamus ratione discutere, ita negligentia mihi videtur, si postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus, quod credimus intelligere" (Cur Deus homo, c. 2; cf. Proslog. c. 1).

[3] In the "Monologium" Anselm brings forward proofs of the existence of God, a posteriori.

Digitized by Google

the eleventh century as to the reality of universal ideas. The great question, which was frequently the occasion of much acrimonious wrangling, was: "An universalia sint realia?" The *Nominalists* denied the objective existence of universals, and declared them to be empty sounds ("nomina flatus vocis"), or simple conceptions of our intellect, which have no corresponding objectivity in reality (conceptualism). The *Realists*, on the other hand, maintained the reality of the universal ideas, but with this difference, — the extreme Realists supposed a real existence of universals independent of cognition, whereas the orthodox Realists held that these universal ideas are abstractions of the intellect, which have, however, their cause or origin in concrete individualities; and thus they attributed universality to the entity *conceived*, so that it exists fundamentally ("fundamentaliter") in individual entities, while in the mind conceiving them it exists only formally ("formaliter").

These philosophic views did not remain without influence on theology. The Nominalist *Roscellin*, Canon of Compiègne, and the Realist *Gilbert de la Porrée* (Porretanus), first professor of theology at Paris, and then Bishop of Poitiers, starting from directly opposite assumptions, fell into the same error regarding the Trinity, namely, into Tritheism.

St. Anselm combated the former; and Roscellin, whose errors were condemned by the Council of Soissons in 1092, was obliged to retract. Gilbert, who made a distinction between Deity ("Deitas") and God ("Deus"), found an opponent in St. Bernard, who convicted him of his mistake; on which the Synod of Paris in 1147, and that of Rheims in 1148, rejected the erroneous opinions.

Peter Abelard[1] started on widely different principles from those of St Anselm, — that is, on those of doubt, or scepticism. He was born at Palais, near Nantes, in 1079, and received his education under Roscellin and William of Champeaux, the founder of the cloister school of St. Victor, who died in 1121, as Bishop of Châlons. Abelard successfully combated the false realism of the latter, and after completing his studies taught, first at Melun, afterwards at

[1] *Remusat*, Abélard, Paris, 1845. The various writings of Abelard are collected in *Migne*, l. c. t. clxxviii. Of him St. Bernard writes: "Omnia sibi usurpat in illo humanum ingenium, nihil fidei reservat" (Ep. 188). Cf. Abael. Sic et non: "Dubitando ad inquisitionem venimus" (*Migne*, l. c. col. 1349). "Quod fides humanis rationibus sit adstruenda" (Sic et non, cap. i.); but he also takes occasion to teach: "Fides, quae naturaliter caeteris prior est, tanquam bonorum omnium fundamentum" (Epitome theol. Christ. c. 2. Cf. Introduct. in theol. lib. ii.).

Digitized by Google

Paris. Here he made the acquaintance of the Canon Fulbert, whose niece Heloise he seduced. In order to regain peace of soul, Abelard, who was still a layman, withdrew into the monastery of St. Denys, and opened a new school in one of the priories connected with it; but here he soon experienced great difficulties, and drew upon himself much unpleasantness by the form he gave to, and the errors he inculcated in, his "Introduction to Theology," ("Introductio in theologiam"). The Synod of Soissons, 1121, adjudged this work to the flames, and condemned the author to imprisonment in a monastery.

After regaining his liberty he aroused the indignation of the monks of St. Denys by asserting — what, in point of fact, is the truth — that St. Denys the Areopagite never came to Paris at all. He therefore left the monastery, and betook himself to a solitude near Nogent on the Seine, where he built a hermitage called the Paraclete. His pupils followed him thither; but in 1126 Abelard left this place to accept the abbacy of St. Gildas de Rhuys in Brittany, to which he had been elected. He transferred the Paraclete to Heloise, who had taken the veil.

As the monks, however, persistently resisted his endeavors to reform them, he in 1136 laid aside his official dignity, and resumed his lectures at Paris. Here he again brought forward his old errors, on which account he was attacked by St. Bernard and William, Abbot of Thierry. The Synod of Sens, in 1140, finally condemned these errors. Abelard appealed to Rome, on the journey to which place he himself started; but while yet in France, the papal decision, condemning his doctrine and consigning himself to imprisonment in a monastery, reached him. Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, kindly received him into his cloister. By the interposition of his good offices, he obtained for him absolution from the Pope and reconciliation with St. Bernard. He then gave Abelard a place among the monks, who were edified by his piety. Abelard died at the age of sixty-three, on April 21, 1142, in the Priory of St. Marcel.

Abelard's mind was rather dialectic than speculative. His vehement, restless, and overbearing character often betrays itself in his writings, on which St. Bernard passes this judgment: "Quum de Trinitate loquitur sapit Arium; quum de gratia, sapit Pelagium; quum de persona Christi, sapit Nestorium."[1]

[1] Ep. 192.

Digitized by Google

Not unimportant are the following names: Robert Pulleyne (Robertus Pullenus), an Englishman, successively Professor of Theology at Paris and at Oxford, in 1144 Cardinal and Chancellor of the Roman Church; he died in 1153; — Robert of Melun, Bishop of Hereford in England, from the year 1163; — Alanus of Ryssel ("ab insulis"), monk of Clairvaux, later on Bishop of Auxerre; he composed the "Ars catholicae fidei" and several controversial works against the Jews, Pagans, and Mahometans; he died as a monk in 1202.

Peter Lombard of Novara, however, acquired a special celebrity. He first studied at Bologna; then, in pursuit of a higher education, he frequented the schools of Rheims and Paris. After this he taught theology in the last-named city, whose bishop he became in 1159. He died in 1164.

The principal works of Lombard ("Magister sententiarum") are his Four Books of Sentences, which became of great importance to the scholasticism of the Middle Ages.[1] The first book treats of God, of his attributes, of the Trinity; the second, of the creation, and of the fall into sin; the third, of the incarnation and redemption, of virtues and sins; while the fourth discourses of the sacraments and of the last things.

§ 140. *Flourishing Period of Scholasticism.*

The Mendicant Orders, the members of which pursued with zeal and success the studies of theology and philosophy, became of high importance in promoting learning at this epoch.

Aristotle was the principal guide in philosophy for the scholastics (schoolmen). They explained the writings of the Stagirite, taking heed, the while, of the errors into which the Arabian[2] and Jewish interpreters had fallen; these they confuted as they proceeded. Among the most famous men of this time are: —

Alexander of Hales ("Dr. irrefragabilis, fons vitae"), an Englishman of the Franciscan Order; he died in 1245. He taught at Paris, and beside his exegetical and philosophical works, he, at the command of Pope Innocent IV., composed a "Summa theologiae," in

[1] *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. cxci., cxcii.

[2] Avicenna (Ibn. Sina, + 1037), Averroes (Ibn. Roschd. + 1198). Among the Jewish philosophers are Avicebron (Ibn. Gebriol, + 1070), a Neoplatonist, and Moses Maimonides (+ 1204), who was the most important Aristotelian.

Digitized by Google

a strictly syllogistic form, taking for his model the Sentences of Peter Lombard.

Beatus *Albertus Magnus*, Albert the Great, of the family of Bollstädt, was born in 1193 at Lauingen, in Suabia. After entering the Dominican Order he taught at Paris and Cologne; in 1254 he was invested with the dignity of provincial for Germany, and in 1260 was nominated Bishop of Ratisbon. Two years later he resigned this latter office, and died at Cologne in 1280.

Albert had a thorough knowledge of and a great veneration for Aristotle ("alter Aristoteles"), without, however, being a blind admirer of him. The value of his work on the physical sciences is still acknowledged by naturalists. He also greatly distinguished himself in theology.

Of still greater importance in the erudition of the Middle Ages, was Albert's renowned pupil, St. Thomas Aquinas,[1] or Thomas, Count of Aquino ("Dr. angelicus"). He was born at Rocca Sicca, near Naples, in 1225 or 1227, and was confided to the Benedictines of Monte Casino for his early education. He then frequented the University of Naples, where he remained six years, during which time, amid the general depravity of manners, he preserved his original innocence and piety. Notwithstanding the opposition of his parents, Thomas entered the Order of St. Dominic, and became the pupil of Albertus Magnus at Cologne. After completing his studies Thomas taught in Cologne, Paris, Bologna, and Naples. He persistently refused to accept the ecclesiastical dignities offered to him, including the Archbishopric of Naples. Pope Gregory X. summoned him to attend the Fourteenth Œcumenical Council at Lyons in 1274. The saint died at Fossanova, on his journey thither. Pope John XXII. canonized the great doctor in 1323; and Pius V. raised him to the rank of "Doctor ecclesiae" in 1567.

The works of St. Thomas[2] are distinguished by their copious flow of thought, their depth of speculation, and by clearness of statement. In philosophy he adhered to Aristotle, in theology to St. Augustine. The writings he has left are of very great importance

[1] *Werner*, St. Thomas of Aquino. 3 vols. Ratisbon, 1858. *Jourdain*, La philosophie de St. Thomas d'Aquin, tom. ii. Paris, 1852. Life and Labors of St. Thomas of Aquino, by the *Very Rev. Roger Bede Vaughan, O.S.B.*, in two volumes. London, 1871–1872.

[2] The most important philosophical work of St. Thomas is the "Summa contra Gentiles" or "philosophica." A new critical edition of his works is being made by order of Leo XIII.

Digitized by Google

to philosophy and theology; therefore the study of these works has been repeatedly recommended by Popes and Councils,[1] and has lately been most emphatically urged by Pope Leo XIII.

Lastly, St. Thomas acquired fame as a poet; his hymns[2] are in high repute; while in his work "De regimine principum" he develops and defends the theory of Christian Government.[3]

The Franciscan John of Fidanza, or St. Bonaventure[4] ("Dr. seraphicus"), is not less distinguished for his learning and piety. He was born in 1221, at Bagnarea, in Tuscany, but for his education frequented the University of Paris, where as early as 1253 he obtained a professorship of theology, and at the age of thirty-five years became the general of his order, the interior disorders and contentions of which he brought under due regulation.[5] Pope Clement IV. wished to make him Archbishop of York, but desisted at the request of Bonaventure; on the other hand, Gregory X., in 1273, compelled him to accept the Bishopric of Albano. In the year following Bonaventure attended the Œcumenical Council of Lyons, and died while it was still in session, July 14, 1274.

Bonaventure, who was canonized by Sixtus IV. (1482), and whom Sixtus V. placed among the doctors of the Church, acquired great fame by his mystical writings.[6] But both his philosophical and scholastico-theological works, of which the principal ones are the "Breviloquium" and the "Centiloquium," are highly esteemed, although their author does not on these subjects reach the level of St. Thomas. As a mystic, however, he surpasses him.

After the death of St. Thomas Aquinas, the doctors of the Sorbonne in 1276 attacked three of his propositions as erroneous, and in the following year the professors of Oxford censured four propositions of the renowned teacher. Even members of the Dominican Order took exception to some assertions of Brother Thomas; they were called to order by the general chapters of Milan in 1278, and of Paris in 1279. Some views of St. Thomas were also disputed by the Minorites, whereas the general chapter of 1286 rendered it imperative on all Dominicans to disseminate his doctrines.

1 Pope John XXII. said of Thomas: "Ipse [S. Thomas] plus illuminavit ecclesiam quam omnes alii Doctores: in cujus libris plus proficit homo uno anno, quam in aliorum doctrina toto tempore vitae suae."

2 See § 150.

3 *Jourdain*, l. c. i. 395 sqq. *Schatzler*, Th. Aq., etc. Rome, 1874.

4 *Bertheaumier*, Hist. de St. Bonaventure.

5 See § 187.

6 A new edition of his complete works is now in preparation.

Digitized by Google

The most prominent opponents of the Angelical Doctor from the Order of the Minorites were: William de la Marre, professor at Oxford, and William Varron (Ware), professor at Paris; and more especially the pupil of the latter, John Duns Scotus ("Dr. subtilis"), — from whom the school of the Scotists derives its name, — who was born between the years 1245 and 1266. At an early period of his life he entered the Franciscan Order, and taught theology and philosophy at Oxford and Paris. Subsequently the celebrated doctor was sent to Cologne; but he died in 1308, shortly after his arrival there. The manner in which Scotus states his propositions is obscure. He lacks the unction of St. Bonaventure and the clearness of St. Thomas. The many subtleties he makes use of render the study of his works difficult.[1]

Unhappily, the polemics between the Thomists and Scotists were not always conducted in a tranquil manner and by means of learned arguments. Too often the controversialists were excited by passion, and assailed their opponents in terms of bitterness and mockery, notwithstanding which the discussion proved of great advantage to the studies of philosophy and theology.

The most eminent of the disciples of St. Thomas are: the Dominican Peter de Tarentaise, who ascended the papal throne under the name of Innocent V. (+ 1276); the Augustinian hermit Ægidius (Giles) Colonna of Rome ("Dr. fundatissimus"), Archbishop of Bourges (+ 1316); and Hervæus Natalis (of Nedellec), General of the Dominicans (+ 1323), who was the special opponent of Duns Scotus.

Among the pupils of Scotus, Anthony Andrea ("Dr. dulcifluus," + 1320) and Francis of Mayronis ("Magister abstractionum," + 1325) acquired great celebrity.

The controversies between the Thomists and Scotists had reference chiefly to the actuality of universals; and in theology to the doctrines of grace and of liberty, and of the satisfaction made by Christ, which Thomas affirmed to be in itself superabundant ("superabundans"), while Scotus makes its value dependent on a "gratuita acceptatio" of God (theory of acceptation). Then Scotus explains transubstantiation by the annihilation of the substance of bread, while Thomas affirms that the glorified body of Christ is adduced or introduced into the accidents ("per adductionem" or "introductionem"); and lastly, came the reference to the doctrine of the

[1] Op. omn. ed. *Wadding*. 12 vols. fol. Lugd. 1639.

Digitized by Google

Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which the Thomists denied, but which the Scotists rightly affirmed.

Roger Bacon, an Englishman ("Dr. mirabilis," + 1294), was a Franciscan, a man distinguished alike for learning and originality. He occupied himself chiefly with mathematics, the physical sciences, and languages; in his philosophical studies he was not free from error, and was especially addicted to astrology. Like John of Salisbury, his countryman, he complained that scholasticism was too narrow and conservative. He advocated a great reformation in the modes of studying science,[1] protested against a too scrupulous adherence to authority and to the prescriptions of custom, favored freer investigation and a more frequent recourse to experiments, though he by no means brought forward knowledge as conflicting with faith.

Neither can learning and originality be denied to the Spaniard Raymond Lullus ("Dr. illuminatus"). He was a self-constituted instructor, in whose writings rationalistic views and cabalistic teachings are combined.[2] Lullus invented the "great art" ("ars universalis scientiarum"), called by his name. It was to enable one to obtain information in all questions of science without exertion or study; it is, in fact, only a plaything, a work got up for sport. Some of his errors were condemned by Gregory XI. He was martyred by the Mahometans in 1315.

The Dominican Vincent of Beauvais (+ 1264), who was tutor to the sons of Louis IX. of France, possessed great learning and extensive reading, as is evident from his "Speculum," a work divided into three parts, — "doctrinale, historiale, et naturale."

The main results of the collective achievements of mediæval erudition are given as clearly as they are correctly in the "Divina Commedia" of Dante, which can in truth be styled a poetical summary of mediæval philosophy and theology. The learned and genial poet (+ 1321) selected Thomas Aquinas as his principal guide, and quotes entire articles of the Angelic Doctor, dressed up in a poetical garb. Dante also proves that he was equally conversant with the writings of other scholastic theologians and philosophers, and not less so with those who ranged the fields of history and of the natural sciences. He was also well acquainted with the works of the pagan classics.

[1] Opus maj. (1266), ed. *Sam. Jebb.* London, 1733. *Dr. J. S. Brewer* added "Opus tertium in compendium philosophiae." 3 vols. London, 1863.

[2] Op. ed. Mogunt. 1721 sqq. 10 vols. fol.

Digitized by Google

§ 141. *The Mystics.*

Among the mystics [1] of this age, St. Bernard ("Dr. mellifluus") stands prominently forward. He was born in 1091, at Fontaine, near Dijon, and his universal activity has already been described.

The principal mystical writings [2] of St. Bernard are his six treatises, "De diligendo Deo," "De gradibus humilitatis," and particularly the letter addressed to Pope Eugene "De consideratione." His sermons are also full of profound thought. Bernard's style of writing is lively, the form somewhat exuberant, yet without being obscure and liable to be misunderstood.

The cloistral school of St. Victor in Paris, founded by William of Champeaux (+ 1109), became a fruitful nursery of mysticism. The renowned rectors, *Hugh* and *Richard,* strove to combine scholasticism and mysticism into one harmonious system.

Hugh [3] was educated in the monastery of Hamersleben, in the diocese of Halberstadt, and came to Paris in 1118, in order to complete his studies. His successful career in the pursuits of knowledge won for him the honorable title of "Alter Augustinus." The writings of Hugh are penetrated throughout by contemplative mystical aspiration. His most important scholastico-mystical work is his treatise on the Sacraments, which is as valuable from its contents, which comprise the whole theological sphere, as from its fascinating style.

Richard of St. Victor, the pupil and successor of Hugh, was in complete harmony with his predecessor. He was a native of Scotland (+ 1173), and was not less given to speculation than to contemplation, as is shown by his work [4] "De Trinitate" and his treatises "De praeparatione ad contemplationem" and "De contemplatione."

The peculiar inclination of Richard to mysticism was not shared by his successor *Walter de St. Victor;* on the contrary, he manifested a formal opposition to scholastic theology, which found an expression in his work, "Contra quatuor Franciae labyrinthos." [4]

John of Salisbury is also to be reckoned among the mystics. He was born in 1110 or 1120, and was the companion of St. Thomas

[1] Compare the works on mysticism of *Görres, Helfferick, Nouck,* and *Denifle.*

[2] Op. ed. *Mabillon.* *Migne,* Patr. lat. tom. clxxxii.-clxxxv.

[3] *Mauréau,* Hugues de St. Victor. Paris, 1860.

[4] *Migne,* l. c. tom. cxcix. The four labyrinths are: Abelard, Peter Lombard, Peter of Poitiers, and Gilbert de la Porrée.

Digitized by Google

à Becket in his sufferings. He died, as Bishop of Chartres, in 1180. To the great knowledge of theology which he had acquired in France, he united classic culture, yet was inclined to mysticism without assuming an antagonistic position to scholasticism. In his "Metalogicus"[1] he only seeks to prune the overgrowths, while he acknowledges and defends the value of logic; but he censures the use to which it is put by modern dialecticians, and chastises their impudent assumptions. In his "Polycraticus" he blames the life led at courts in his time. His contemporary, Walter Map, who was archdeacon at Oxford from the year 1197, composed a similar work.

To conclude the list, Abbot Rupert of Deutz (Tuitiensis, + 1135), known as an exegetical writer, and Abbot William of Thierry, with the Franciscan David of Augsburg (+ 1270), may be numbered among the mystics. In the celebrated and influential St. Hildegard, who was so highly esteemed by her contemporaries, and who lived on the Rupertsberg near Bingen, the mystical element manifested itself in the form of prophetic ecstasy. Her supernatural inspirations are contained in her book "Scivias."

§ 142. *The Scholastics and Mystics towards the End of the Middle Ages.— The several Branches of Learning.*

The assertion that the characteristic of scholasticism in what is called its third period was the predominance of nominalism, which ultimately led to the ruin of scholasticism, is not true; for history has no record of any period in which nominalism was universally predominant, but, on the contrary, proves that this same nominalism was always contested, and that its interpreters did not themselves deduce from its doctrines those final consequences which would, it is true, have led to the overthrow of all learning.

The principal advocates of nominalism are: Peter Aureolus, a Franciscan professor at Paris (+ 1321), and William Durandus of St. Pourçain ("Dr. resolutissimus"), a Dominican professor at the Sorbonne, Paris, from the year 1313, later on Bishop of Meaux (+ 1332); and to whom may be added William of Occam,[2] specially noted for taking part with Louis the Bavarian against the Church. He was a Franciscan; at first the pupil, afterwards the opponent, of Duns Scotus, and professor of the University of Paris ("Dr.

[1] Op. ed. *Giles.* 5 vols. Oxon. 1848. *Migne,* Patr. lat. tom. cxcix.
[2] See § 124.

Digitized by Google

singularis, venerabilis inceptor," + 1347). According to his views, universal ideas are simply the product of the human mind, creations of the imagination, single in themselves, and universal only in the sense that they may be signs[1] of a plurality of objects. His disciples John Buridan, professor at Paris and Vienne, Peter d'Ailly (+ 1425), as well as Nicholas of Clemange (+ 1440), and Gabriel Biel, preacher at the cathedral of Mentz and professor at Tübingen (+ 1495), were Nominalists.

Besides Giles (Ægidius) of Colonna, two Augustinian monks, Gregory of Rimini and Thomas of Strasburg ("de Argentina," + 1357), the Dominican Capreolus ("Princeps Thomistarum," + 1444), the Carthusian Denys, and others undertook the defence of orthodox Realism.

The works of Thomas Bradwardine,[2] professor of Oxford from the year 1325, and subsequently Archbishop of Canterbury (+ 1349), are not free from error; he revived the doctrine of the Predestinatians.

The Spanish physician and jurist Raymond of Sabunde, subsequently priest and professor at Toulouse (about 1436), in his "Theologia naturalis" makes the attempt to demonstrate and to defend the mysteries of Christianity from the "book of Nature;" but in doing this he unwittingly falls into rationalistic errors.

Mystical theology found a learned advocate in John Charlier of Gerson, usually called John Gerson ("Dr. Christianissimus"), professor and chancellor of the University of Paris (+ 1429, at Lyons). He took great interest in the reformatory efforts of his time, but unfortunately was himself led to maintain several erroneous propositions.

In Germany mysticism received special cultivation from the brotherhood called "The Friends of God," who by word and example strove to promote interior piety. Unhappily, many of these departed too widely from positive theology, fell into a false subjectivism, and did not escape erroneous views, or at least made use of incorrect expressions.

The true founder of German mysticism is the Dominican Provincial Master Eckhart, a celebrated preacher, whose writings, however, contain several errors which drew upon him a censure from Pope John XXII.[3] (+ 1329).

[1] "Termini, signa, fictiones quaedam."
[2] De causa adv. Pelag. ii. 3, ed. Savilius. Lond. 1618.
[3] *Denzinger*, Enchiridion, p. 179 sqq.

Digitized by Google

Among his pupils, two Dominicans acquired great renown. These were the profound thinker and preacher John Tauler, born 1290 ("Dr. sublimis aut illuminatus," + Strasburg, 1361), and the poet Henry Suso, born 1300 ("Amandus," + Ulm, 1365). They are remarkable for their great interior piety and depth of speculation; but in expression they are sometimes vague, and liable to be misunderstood.

This latter remark applies in a still higher degree to John Ruysbroek[1] ("Dr. extaticus," + 1381). He was prior of the Canons regular, at Grünthal, near Brussels. Many of his own contemporaries took exceptions to his expressions, which sounded so pantheistic that afterwards Gerson also became the opponent of his views.

The unknown author of the work so highly prized by Luther, "German Theology," deviated yet more widely from the beaten track of orthodoxy. He loses himself entirely in pantheistic dualism, although it may be conceded that he was probably more incorrect in his manner of expression than heretical in thought..

The most influential among the mystics is undoubtedly the pious Thomas à Kempis (Thomas Hamerken),[2] whose "Imitation of Christ" contains the purest and noblest mysticism. It has been, and still is, the guide on the path to perfection for millions of souls.[3]

On the treatment of the respective branches of theology we would briefly remark: The scholastics and mystics alike occupied themselves with the interpretation of Scripture; but the former directed their attention rather to the meaning than to the letter of the Bible, the several books of which were explained in a fourfold

[1] Op. omn. ed. *Surius*. Colon. 1555.

[2] Op. omn. ed. *Somalius*, S. J., revised by *Amort*. Colon. 1759. The authorship of the "Imitation of Christ" is contested. Among those who ascribe it to Thomas à Kempis are: *Amort* (Scutum Kempense, in appendix to his edition, and Deductio critica, Aug. Vind. 1761), and *Malon* (Recherchès hist. et critiques sur le véritable auteur de l'Imitation. Paris et Tournay, 1858). As early as the fifteenth century the little book was ascribed to Chancellor *Gerson*. Gregory, in his "Mémoires sur le véritable auteur," etc., designates the Benedictine *John Gersen*, Abbot of St. Stephen, near Vercelli (1240), as the author. The "Civiltà Cattol." 1875, n. 590, 595, 600, declares for *Gersen's* authorship. The defenders of the latter theory of authorship (see *Hergenröther*, v. iii. p. 318) laid a special stress on the "Codex Vercell. De avocatis," found at Paris, 1839, by the President de Gregorio.

[3] St. Mechtildis of Magdeburg (+ between 1270 and 1280), St. Gertrude of Eisleben (+ 1292), and her sister the younger Mechtildis, as also Christina Ebneriu (+ 1356), composed mystical writings.

Digitized by Google

sense.[1] The Holy Scriptures were at that time for the most part read in the Latin Vulgate.

The Council of Vienne, however, earnestly recommended the study of the Oriental languages. Anselm of Laon (+1117)[2] and Rupert of Deutz[3] (+1135) were celebrated expositors of Holy Writ; together with Stephen, Abbot of Citeaux, who amended the Vulgate, and Hugh à Sancto Caro (+1260), who composed a commentary ("postillae") on the Holy Scriptures and a concordance of the Bible.[4] The clearness with which St. Thomas Aquinas, in his commentaries, illustrates the profound meaning hid in the Gospels and in the Epistles of the Apostles is in a manner absolutely marvellous.[5]

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the most celebrated expositors were Nicholas of Lyra ("Dr. planus et utilis," +1341), named the Postillator, who rather fell back on the literal meaning of the sacred books than rose to their spiritual sense;[6] Alphonso Tostatus, professor at Salamanca, and subsequently Bishop of Avila (+1454); and the Carthusian Denys (+1471).

In the fifteenth century the study of the Oriental languages received a new impetus in Italy,[7] Germany,[8] and Spain. Here the renowned Cardinal Ximenes was occupied in forwarding the publication of the Complutensian Polyglot edition of the Bible, in which several Spanish Orientalists took part. Erasmus took charge of a new edition of the Greek text of the New Testament, which he enriched by a Latin translation, with paraphrases and notes taken from Greek expositors.

Translations of the Bible in the vernacular tongues were also made, and were never prohibited by the Church, as the bishops of

[1] "*Litera* gesta docet, quid credas *Allegoria*,
Moralis quid agas, quo tendas *Anagogia*."

[2] Glossa interlinearis in *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. clxii.

[3] Op. omn. ap. *Migne*, Patr. lat. tom. clxvii.–clxx.

[4] Cf. *Quetif* et *Echard*. Script. ord. Praedic. i. 194 sqq. Postil. in univ. Bibl. 7 vols. fol. Paris, 1548. Concord. sac. Biblior. Basil. 1551.

[5] "Expositio in IV. Evang." also called "Catena aurea" (the golden chain), and "Comment. in omnes Div. Pauli Ap. epis." Newly edited. 3 vols. Leod. 1837 sqq.

[6] His writings were specially studied by Luther, which fact gave rise to the saying: "Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset."

[7] Cf. *Tiraboschi*, Storia della letteratura Italiana, tom. vi. 2, p. 119 sqq.

[8] The Dominican Peter Schwartz, in 1477, composed a Hebrew Grammar. Reuchlin (see § 160) worked with a special zeal for the study of this language, which, however, had before his time been introduced into several universities.

Digitized by Google

England in 1826 publicly declared. Before Luther's time Germany possessed fourteen editions of the Bible in the High German, and four in the Low German dialect. The study of Christian morals was usually combined with that of dogma. St. Thomas Aquinas, indeed, treated of the one separately from the other. The work of Abelard, "Scito te ipsum," or "Ethica," is full of inaccuracies, and presents anything but a Christian morality. William Peraldus[1] and Raymond of Pennaforte[2] composed larger works on Morals (Casuistry).

The study of canon law was also ardently pursued. Among the most significant of the canonists of this era were: John Gratian, professor at Bologna, and Raymond of Pennaforte; to whom may be added the Popes Alexander III., Innocent III., Innocent IV., Gregory IX., with Boniface VIII., and Archbishop Tudeschi of Palermo, etc.

The Middle Ages have but few works on universal history; on the other hand, they abound in chronicles, annals, descriptions of individual countries, biographies, etc.

The philosophical genius of Nicholas of Cusa (born 1401 at Cues, near the Moselle), Dean of St. Florin in Coblentz, and subsequently Cardinal and Bishop of Brixen, whose spirit embraced every department of human knowledge, was renowned as a reformer, statesman, and man of learning. At first he was a defender of the principles of the Council of Basle; but afterwards he changed sides, and became an ardent upholder of the rights of the Apostolic See. This Prince of the Church, well versed as he was in philosophy and theology, as also in the physical sciences and in classical studies, devoted his chief attention to elevating the religious standing, together with that of learning, of both the clergy and the people of Germany. The writings he has left behind him[3] contain the most profound speculations, in which the results of scholasticism and mysticism are laid down with the utmost impartiality, and in a classical form.

§ 143. *Studies of the Humanists.*[4]

Classical studies, which are erroneously termed a revival of learning, form a beautiful proof of the aspiration after knowledge which animated the Middle Ages.

[1] Summa de virtutibus et vitiis. Ed. Paris, 1629.

[2] See §§ 130, 135. He wrote "Summa de poenit. et matrimonio," also called "Summa Raymundiana." Ed. Rom. 1605.

[3] Ed. Faber Stapulens. Paris, 1514; Basil. 1565.

[4] See *Janssen's* famous Hist. of the German People.

Digitized by Google

Without being absolutely neglected, the study of the pagan classics had during the mediæval times taken a position in the background, until in the fifteenth century the predilection for their works awakened a more general and zealous study of classical antiquity.[1]

The negotiations for the union of the Greeks from the thirteenth century, and the Greek refugees who fled to Italy after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453, greatly contributed to stimulate the study of the literary treasures they had brought with them.

These expatriated scholars were warmly welcomed, both in Rome and Florence, by Cosmo de' Medici, and soon gathered around them a circle of learned pupils from various countries, who under their direction commenced a course of classical studies.

In the course of time these refugees, being particularly patronized by the higher orders of the clergy and by several Popes, spread themselves over Italy, Spain, France, and Germany, everywhere meeting with friends and admirers who showed them kindness and afforded them aid.

As the study of the pagan authors was eulogized as the source of true human culture (humanities), its promoters were called Humanists. At first they were chiefly occupied with the profane sciences, but soon they turned their attention also to theological discipline.

The study of the pagan classics and pagan philosophy was not without its use for science, nor even for theology; yet at the same time it exercised an injurious effect on theological studies and on religious life.

In fact, the chief use of humanistic studies was to restore to the

[1] See §§ 98, 99. *Daniel*, Classic Studies in Christian Society. Dante (+ 1321), Petrarch (+ 1374), Boccaccio (+ 1375), and others were well versed in the classical lore of antiquity. Nicholas of Cusa, who brought many Grecian manuscripts from Constantinople to the West, was well read in ancient literature. At the Union Synod, held at Florence, 1439, John Turrecremata, the Dominican John of Ragusa, and the Abbot of the Camaldolites, Ambrosius Traversari, afforded splendid proofs of their acquaintance with Grecian literature. At the suggestion of Boccaccio, Leontius Pilatus, a pupil of the Greek monk Barlaam, was in the year 1350 installed at Florence as teacher of the Greek language. In the year 1390 the Greek Manuel Chrysoloras settled in Italy, and was received in many places, of which the last was Rome, as teacher of Grecian literature. Among other distinguished Greeks who emigrated to Italy were Theodore Gaza (+ 1478), George of Trebizond (+ about 1484), John Argyropylus (+ 1486), Constantine, and J. And. Lascaris, Gemistius Pletho, Bessarion, and others, concerning whom see *Tiraboschi*, Storia della letteratura, tom. vi. pp. 1, 2.

Digitized by Google

learned a classical Latinity, which supplanted the degenerate and awkward language of the later scholastics, and rendered it possible for theologians to clothe their ideas in a pleasing and graceful form. The Humanists also effected much good in the fields of history and of patristic literature; and this because they opened sources, and placed available means before the student, which had not been accessible before.

But great as may be these merits, which are by no means due exclusively to the Humanists, they are counterbalanced by the evil which resulted from humanism.

One fruit of humanistic studies was an almost frantic predilection for genuine classical expressions, as is evidenced in a truly ludicrous manner [1] in the writings of the Humanists. Not less disadvantageous was the overrating of the pagan philosophers, Plato [2] and Aristotle,[3] whose writings were by some Humanists placed on the same level as the Holy Scriptures; while some, like Marsilius Ficinus, even wished them to be read in the churches, together with the Scriptures.

Yet worse even than this was the unworthy warfare waged by these worshippers of classic antiquity against scholasticism. They would willingly have substituted their own theological works — brilliant in form, but for the most part worthless and insignificant — in the place of the profound speculations of St. Thomas and other scholastics of the Middle Ages, which they designated as barbarous and unfitted for the age.[4]

[1] *Gaume*, Le ver rongeur. Many Humanists call Christ Heros; the Blessed Virgin of Loretto, Dea Lauretana, Spes Deorum. The Sacred College they name Patres conscripti, Latii senatus; the priests, Flamines; the bishops, Archi-flamines. For heaven they say Olympus; for hell, Erebus; for faith, persuasio. Bembo describes Christ as Minerva e Jovis capite orta; the Holy Ghost is Aura Zephyri coelestis; and so on.

[2] The Greek Gemistius Pletho in 1440 founded a Platonic Academy in Florence. The most prominent Platonists were Marsilius Ficinus (+ 1499), who kept a lamp burning before the image of Plato; John Pico of Mirandola; and Angelus Politianus, a pupil of Ficinus. See, on this and other matters of science, the valuable work of *Stöckl*, History of the Philosophy of the Middle Ages.

[3] Peter Pomponatius, professor in Padua and Bologna (+ 1526), is the representative of the new disciples of Aristotle. In his work "De Immortalitate" he contests the immortality of the soul. He also attacks the doctrine of Providence, and denies the existence of miracles. To excuse this contradiction to dogma, he maintained that a proposition might be philosophically false and theologically true, and *vice versa*. The Lat. V. censured these views. (*Harduin*, Acta Conc. ix. 1719.)

[4] *Laurentius Valla* (+ 1456), teacher in Naples and Rome, wrote some short and

Digitized by Google

Humanism, lauded by its adherents as the "golden age," also exercised a very pernicious influence on the religious life. It might be true that many Humanists were themselves personally religious men, who valued their linguistic attainments chiefly for their use in the service of the Church. The progress of the vast majority, however, was to religious indifference and to frivolity. They ridiculed and derided with special scorn such of the priests and monks as withstood their heathenish innovations. Even Erasmus took part in these polemics by his "Encomium moriae;" but the worst that was brought forward in this respect were the "Epistolae obscurorum virorum." Not a few of the Humanists undermined morality by their lascivious writings, and not infrequently placed themselves in a formal opposition to the Church. This is distinctly seen in the writings of the infidel and immoral Ulrich von Hutten. Nicholas Machiavelli of Florence (+1530), a Pagan in his teachings and morals, reproduces in his work "Del Principe" the faithless policy of ancient Rome. He views the temporal prince as the source of all power, and proclaims a base and crafty selfishness.

Unhappily, many of the Coryphæi (leaders) of Humanism were destitute of every noble sentiment, and showed themselves as men of dubious character, who, according to circumstances, could play the part of servile flatterers or of shameless calumniators, but who, alike in the eulogies they bestow and in the invectives they pour forth, are equally impudent and perverse.

In Germany humanistic studies were chiefly pursued at the University of Erfurt. Here it was that Maternus Pistorius taught, — "the teacher around whom 'the poets' clustered." Canon Mutian, from Gotha, afterwards undertook the direction of these. In Cologne and Munster classic literature also found friends. Rudolph Agricola (1482) taught at Heidelberg, as did also John Reuchlin (+1529), a great proficient in the Hebrew language (see § 142), who afterwards became professor at Ingolstadt; both of these were faithful sons of the Church. John of Dalberg, Curator of the University of Heidelberg, and subsequently Bishop of Worms, was also a patron of the humanities. The learned and able John Trithemius (+1516) prized classical studies, without losing sight of the high value of scholasticism. But the most celebrated Humanist of his time was Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam, — a man of great learning, but destitute of nobility of character, and of uncertain disposition. He was first the friend, then the opponent, of Luther. He died at Basle in 1536 (see §§ 161,

superficial remarks on the original text of the Holy Scriptures and a treatise on Morality, which was more pagan than Christian. The dogmatic of Paul Cortesius is better. (*Tiraboschi*, vi. 1, p. 98.)

Digitized by Google

166). By his edition of the "Fathers of the Church," he did great service to patristic literature. (Op. omn. ed. *Beat. Rhenan.* Basil. 1540 sq. ed. *Le Clerc*, Lugd. 1702 sqq. 10 vols. fol.)

Loyal to Catholic principles were the Spaniard Louis Vivès (+ 1540) and the Frenchman William Budaeus (+ 1542). These two, with Erasmus, formed the literary triumvirate. To these must be added Fisher, Bishop of Rochester; John Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, London; Lilly, professor in the Cathedral School of St. Paul's; and the statesman Thomas More.

2. Heresies and Schisms.

§ 144. *Attempts to unite the Schismatic Greeks. — The Smaller Sects of the East.*

The attempts at reuniting the schismatic Greeks,[1] were not crowned with enduring success. The Council of Bari (1098) in Lower Italy brought back to the mother Church the Greeks living there. But neither the efforts of the Archbishop Chrysolanus of Milan, who was sent to Constantinople by Paschal II., nor the colloquies of Bishop Anselm of Havelberg, with the Archbishop Nicetas of Nicomedia, nor the synod held in Constantinople, in 1166, by the Patriarch Michael Anchialus, at the command of the Emperor Emmanuel Comnenus, were successful in influencing this haughty and schismatic people to submit to the Apostolic See; for, oppressed as they were by emperors who themselves desired to impose dogmas on their subjects, they had lost all sense of what constitutes the true religious life. Nor did the Crusades advance the work of union; still less, the establishment of the Latin Empire in Constantinople.

The colloquies which took place between the Patriarch Germanus and the legates of Pope Gregory IX.[2] served only to bring to light the deep aversion entertained by the Greeks to any measure which would bring them nearer to Rome.

The prospects for this union seemed to improve after the downfall of the Latin Empire, when the Greek emperor, Palæologus, desired to be reconciled to Rome, — more, however, from political than from religious motives. Yet the negotiations with Popes Urban IV. and Clement IV. did not accomplish their purpose. On

[1] See § 101.

[2] *Matthew.* Paris, Hist. Angl. ann. 1237, gives the letters of the patriarch to the Pope and cardinals, together with their replies. Cf. *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1231, n. 57 sqq. *Harduin*, vii. 149 sqq. For the transactions which treated of the "filioque" and the "Azyme," see *Raynald*, Ad ann. 1233, n. 5 sqq.

Digitized by Google

the other hand, the desired union was effected at the Fourteenth Œcumenical Council of Lyons (Lugd. II.), under Pope Gregory X., 1274, in forwarding which St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bonaventure, equally with the learned Grecian Veccus, were particularly instrumental. Yet the schismatic bishops and the people, who had been wrought up to fanaticism by the rough, uncouth monks, were so little satisfied that under the reign of the Emperor Andronicus II., the son and successor of Michael, the union which had been concluded, together with those who adhered to it and those who had brought it about, were anathematized.

The subsequent negotiations which were entered into from fear of the Turks led to no better result; because the Grecian emperors were more intent on obtaining assistance from the West against their enemies than anxious to procure the termination of the schism. For this reason the treaties of the Emperor Andronicus III. with the Popes John XXII. and Benedict XII.,[1] who could not agree to the proposals of the Grecian monk Barlaam, and those of the Emperor John V. Palæologus, with Innocent VI. and his successors, had to be again given up.

At length, however, the moment of union seemed to have arrived. After lengthy discussions, the Emperor John VII. Palæologus, the Patriarch Joseph of Constantinople, and many illustrious bishops of the East appeared personally at the Council of Ferrara (Florence), convoked by Pope Eugene IV.; and after long and tedious debates, signed the document of the union on the 6th of July, 1439. Among those who took part in these momentous debates were Cardinal Julian Cesarini; Andrew, Archbishop of Rhodes; Louis, Bishop of Forli, John Turrecremata; the Dominican John of Ragusa; and Ambrose Traversari, Abbot of the Camaldolites. On the side of the Greeks were Bessarion,[2] Archbishop of Nice; and the irreconcilable foe of the union, Marcus Eugenicus, Archbishop of Ephesus.

[1] John XXII. in 1334 sent two bishops to Constantinople. Nicephorus Gregoras, the Grecian historian, a layman, on whom devolved the duty of conferring with the papal legates, because the clergy were for the most part too ignorant, evaded every disputation with the remark that syllogisms, in which the Latins were so strong, found no place in the teaching regarding the Holy Ghost. Op. ap. *Migne*, Patr. graec. tom. cxlviii., cxlix.

[2] Op. ap. *Migne*, Patr. graec. tom. clxi. Bessarion, from the year 1436 Archbishop of Nice, was at first opposed to, but subsequently in favor of, the union. Isidore of Kiew, Metropolitan of Russia (*Migne*, Patr. graec. tom. clix.), also labored in this cause. Eugene IV. raised both prelates to the cardinalate. Bessarion died at Rome in 1472.

Digitized by Google

The majority of the schismatics refused to ratify the union; and even as early as the year 1443, the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem anathematized the same.

In the capital city itself great difficulties were experienced in carrying out the union. The new patriarch Metrophanes of Cyzicus (+ 1443) met with the most violent opposition; and his successor, Gregorius Mammas, who went to work with more energy, was deposed in 1450. His immediate successors, Arsenius and Gennadius, were both foes to the union. The exertions of the Emperor Constantine IX. in favor of the union were useless. Pope Nicholas V. sent to Constantinople Isidore the Metropolitan of Kiew, who had been banished on account of his attachment to the union. The emperor and the majority of the clergy accepted the union; yet the celebration of the union festival, in 1452, led to an uproar among the populace. The following year the emperor succumbed to the Sultan Mahomet II., who conquered Constantinople, and changed the church of St. Sophia into a mosque. With this the last hope of union vanished; and in the Synod of Constantinople, 1472, under the Patriarch Symeon of Trebisond, the treaty of union was formally rejected.

At the Council of Florence, however, a union with the schismatic Armenians who, under Pope Innocent III., had already for a short time returned to the obedience of the Apostolic See, was effected. Being invited by Eugene IV., their deputies appeared at the council, and in 1440 renounced their errors. They adopted the Nicano-Constantinopolitan Symbol with "filioque," the Synod of Chalcedon, and the doctrine of the two natures, as also that of the two wills and two modes of operation in Christ, besides the seven sacraments, the Athanasian Symbol, the Florentine decree of union with the Greeks, with some Latin festival days. The union, however, was violently opposed by some, and only a part of the Armenians accepted it.

This example was followed by the Jacobites in Egypt (ninth session, on Feb. 4, 1442), and by other smaller sects of the East.

Of the other ancient Oriental sects, the Maronites of Mount Lebanon had returned to the Church as early as the year 1182. The schismatic Bulgarians entered into a temporary communion with the Apostolic See, under their prince Kalojohannes in 1202, at the time of Innocent III.

Among the sects of the Greek Church, besides the Paulicians or Bogomiles, whom we have already mentioned (§ 60), the Hesychasts

Digitized by Google

(ἡσυχασταί), on Mount Athos in Macedonia, must not be forgotten. Their founder was the Abbot Symeon, who guided the monks of that place to a false quietism. It was the learned abbot Barlaam who came forward as the chief opponent against these fanatics, whom he termed Massalians, Umbilicians, Navel-souls (ὀμφαλοψύχοι). Gregory Palamas, afterwards Archbishop of Thessalonica, undertook to defend them.

The Synod of Constantinople, in 1341, decided against Barlaam, who, on account of their doctrine concerning the "uncreated light," had accused the monks of believing in two Gods, — the one visible, the other invisible. Two other synods also decided in favor of the Hesychasts; and they found a special protector in the Emperor Kantakuzenus, who from the year 1355 lived as a monk on Mount Athos.

The points of difference which were discussed at Florence principally regarded the "filioque" and the primacy, together with the doctrines of purgatory, the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, and the special invocation (ἐπίκλησις) of the Holy Ghost on the oblations after consecration.

As respects the "Epiklesis," the Greeks declared that consecration takes place by the words used by Christ, and that the "Epiklesis," like to the "Jube haec perferri" in the Latin canon, only petitioned "that the Holy Ghost should descend upon us and in us, make the bread into the precious body of Christ . . . that it may be to the recipient for the purification of his soul and the remission of his sins, and not to his judgment and condemnation." A similar official declaration was given by Bessarion on the 5th of July, in the name of all the Greek bishops. (*Harduin*, ix. 403; *Mansi*, xxxi. 1045.)

The question of the "Azyme" was disposed of by the declaration of the Greeks, that either leavened or unleavened bread might be used at the altar.

As respects purgatory, it appeared from the proceedings, that the difference did not consist in believing in the existence of a place of purification, but only appertained to the kind of purification and the manner in which it is effected. (*Harduin*, ix. 403.)

The discussions on the addition of "filioque" to the symbol were the most vehement of all. After the splendid defence of this addition made by John of Ragusa, who proved its correctness from the Greek Fathers, especially from St. Basil and St. John Damascene, and by Ambrose Traversari, the Greeks finally gave up, and declared that, "as the Latin Fathers taught that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son as from one sole principle and by one spiration, and that they themselves had no other meaning than that of those Fathers who taught that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father through the Son, therefore all obstacles to union are removed."

The prerogatives of the Apostolic See were also acknowledged by the

Digitized by Google

Greeks after a long discussion; but this was done without infringing on the rights of the Eastern patriarchs. (*Harduin*, ix. 413.)

The decree of union had been drawn up by Traversari, and after some alterations it was signed by the Pope, the cardinals, and the Western bishops present; also by the Greek emperor and his bishops, with the exception of Marcus Eugenicus. The decisions respecting the Primacy run thus: "Item definimus sanctam Apostolicam sedem et Romanum Pontificem in universum orbem tenere primatum et ipsum Pontificem Romanum successorem esse beati Petri, principis Apostolorum et verum Christi vicarium totiusque ecclesiae caput et omnium Christianorum patrem ac doctorem existere, et ipsi in beato Petro pascendi, regendi et gubernandi universalem ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse: quemadmodum *etiam* in gestis œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur. Renovantes insuper ordinem traditum in canonibus ceterorum venerabilium patriarcharum; ut patriarcha Constantinopolitanus secundus sit post sanctissimum Romanum Pontificem, tertius vero Alexandrinus, quartus autem Antiochenus et quintus Hierosolymitanus, salvis videlicet privilegiis omnibus et juribus eorum."

The assertion made by the Gallicans, especially by De Marca (Concord. sacerd. et imper. iii. c. 8. n. 5), and in more modern times repeated by Döllinger and others, — that, instead of "quemadmodum *etiam*" should be read "quemadmodum *et* . . . et," — is disproved by the original documents and by the copies of the decree of union, which have "quemadmodum etiam." The Civ. Cattolica, Quad. 478, ser. 7, vol. 9, with additions of the fac-simile of the codices of Florence and the codex of the Vatican. The original codex extant in the public archives at Carlsruhe has *etiam*. The same text is contained in the copies in the various libraries of Italy. See "Criticism of the Florentine Decree of Union" (Leips. 1870), by Theodore Frommann, a Protestant scholar. When the opponents appeal to Flavius Blondus (Biondi), the secretary of Eugene IV., in whose historical work *et* stands instead of *etiam* (lib. 10, decad. 3), this can prove nothing when brought in contact with the original document; the reading *et* being probably a mistake of the copyist.

The other assertion of Döllinger, that it should be "juxta eum modum," instead of "quemadmodum," according to the Greek text *καθ' ὃν τρόπον*, is erroneous, since the Latin text is by no means a translation from the Greek, but is the text agreed upon between the Greeks and Latins.

Finally, the words Τὸν Ῥωμαϊκὸν ἀρχιερέα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ πρωτεῖον κατέχειν, which are wanting in some codices, are not a forgery, but are found in the first original (the Florentine Codex A) and in most manuscripts.

Against the one-sided representations of the Florentine proceedings made by Syropulus, see *Leon Allatii*, in R. Creyghton. appar. version. et notas ad hist conc. Florent. script. a Sylv. Syropul. exercitationum, P. I., Rom. 1660.

Digitized by Google

§ 145. *The Smaller Sects of the West.*

Among the less important leaders of the sects that arose at this epoch may be numbered Arnold of Brescia, the demagogue, whom we have already mentioned, — he fell into several errors of faith; — the two fanatics, Tanchelm (1115–1124), who carried on his disorders first in Utrecht and subsequently in Antwerp, where he was successfully opposed by St. Norbert; and Eudo da Stella (Eon), who travelled through Brittany and Gascony, until he was at last imprisoned, in 1148, at the command of the Council of Rheims.

Peter of Bruys (1104–1124), the impetuous zealot for the restoration of Church discipline, founder of the Petrobrusians, fell into the error of rejecting infant baptism and the holy sacrifice of the Mass; he ordered churches and altars to be destroyed, crucifixes and the like to be burnt; and at St. Gilles he publicly ridiculed the commandment of the Church to abstain and fast on Good Friday. The infuriated people threw him into the flames of the funeral pile he had himself erected.

After this, Henry of Lausanne placed himself at the head of a party called Henricians. He came upon the scene as a preacher of penance, and was at first received in a friendly manner by Bishop Hildebert of Le Mans, but in a short time was expelled because he enticed his hearers to the performance of senseless acts. On this he joined the Petrobrusians, to whose errors he added others. This induced the Bishop of Arles to bring the matter before the Council of Pisa, in 1135, as heresy. Henry promised to amend, but did not perform his promise, on which account he was arrested by order of the Archbishop of Toulouse, and kept in prison until his death in 1149. His errors were controverted by St. Bernard and by the cardinal legate Alberich.

The Apostolic Brethren, founded in 1260 by the enthusiast Gerard Segarelli of Parma, was professedly intended to restore apostolical simplicity to the Church. It was suppressed by Honorius IV. on account of the heretical doctrines put forth by the members of this association; and again by Nicholas IV., in 1290, it was denounced as heretical. Gerard refused submission to the papal decision, on which account he was punished as an obstinate heretic (1300). Then Fra Dolcino of Milan took the lead among these fanatics, and excited them to so great a degree that they barricaded themselves at Novara and then at Vercelli in such a way

Digitized by Google

as to render it necessary to proceed against them by an armed force (1307). Dolcino and his spiritual sister Margareta were put to death.

The doctrine of the Brethren and Sisters of the Free Spirit (Suestriones), who committed acts of the coarsest licentiousness, was practically pantheistic; under different names this sect sustained itself to the fourteenth century.

Amaleric of Chartres (Bena), professor at Paris, also disseminated pantheistic views; his disciples, William of Paris (the goldsmith) and David of Dinanto, even maintained (1204) that God was the essential matter ("esse materiale") of all things, and they denied that any difference existed between virtue and vice.

The followers of Wilhelmina of Bohemia, who is said to have given herself out as an incarnation of the Holy Ghost, and who died in Milan in 1282, also committed great excesses, which called forth the energetic opposition of the superiors of the Church.

The Stedingers of Friesland revolted against the Archbishop of Bremen (1187), refused to pay tithes, despised the doctrine of the Church, and murdered the priests. In the year 1234 a crusade was inaugurated against them. A number of them became reconciled to the Church. The Passagians (from "passagium," pilgrimage?), who were inclined to Judaism, also belonged to the heretical anti-ecclesiastical party of this time.

§ 146. *The Cathari (Albigenses and Waldenses).*

That family of the sects of the Middle Ages which bore the name of Cathari[1] (*καθαροί*) was characterized by an opposition against the Church combined with gnostic errors. Under the specious pretext of wishing to restore Christianity to its original form, they made war against the Church, which, according to them, was disfigured by riches.

The opinion that these destructive sects took their rise from an antipathy conceived by some Græco-slavic monks against some Latin mode of worship which had been imposed upon them, is not correct. The case is contrariwise; these sects originated from a union of the gnostic sects of the East, the so-called Paulicians or Bogomiles, with some unquiet spirits who had been scandalized at a rich and powerful Church. This assertion is not only supported by exterior reasons, but also by the peculiar doctrines and regulations of these

[1] *Schmidt*, Hist. et doctrine des Cathares ou Albigeois. 2 vols. Paris, 1849.

Digitized by Google

sects, which so greatly contradict Christian teaching in every point as to make it scarcely possible to consider them Christian at all.

The doctrine of the Cathari is Dualism. They rejected the principal dogmas of Christianity,—the most holy Trinity, the creation, original sin, the incarnation and redemption. They looked on souls as fallen spirits; and the resurrection was to them the reunion with its heavenly body, of the soul, now imprisoned in an earthly body.

The Cathari rejected the holy sacraments, together with the dogmas of the Church. Only by name they retained the Last Supper (blessed bread) and confession ("Servitium, appareillamentum"). Instead of baptism by water, they had what they called the baptism of the Holy Ghost, or the Consolamentum (consolation), which, according to their doctrine, frees the receiver from all sin without any kind of contrition. Most of the Cathari put off receiving the Consolamentum till their life drew to its close. In case the receiver fell back into sin,—as, for example, ate meat,—he must again have recourse to this (reconsolation). To avert this danger, the "consoled" ("consolati") frequently had recourse to the "Endura,"—a process by which, through starvation, bleeding, poison, or other means, they put an end to their lives.

Moreover, all the Cathari were opposed to the ecclesiastical hierarchy, to the veneration of pictures and of saints, to pilgrimages, etc. On the other hand, they had a hierarchy of their own, an esoteric and exoteric doctrine; and they were divided into two classes, the perfect and the believing ("perfecti et credentes"), being in this like the old Manichæans, to whose doctrine their system of morals had great resemblance.

Like them, they forbade every touch of matter, rejected matrimony, prohibited the use of flesh, the killing of animals, all intercourse with worldly-minded people, and all warfare, while they kept strict fasts. But all this was only for the perfect; the imperfect had a more extended license,—they might eat meat, perform military service, contract marriage, etc. According to the testimony of Rainer Sachoni,—who for sixteen years was bishop of this sect, but subsequently became a convert and an inquisitor,—many of the Cathari practised the most filthy impurities, and taught that sin was not thereby committed.

In order to diffuse their errors, the leaders of this sect made use of every means at their disposal. They found friends and adherents alike among the laity and the clergy, especially in southern France,

Digitized by Google

where a variety of causes contributed to facilitate the propagation of this heresy.

The Cathari, who received the name of Albigenses from the city Albi, or Albigua, found powerful protectors in many French counts, —chiefly, Raymond VI. of Toulouse, and the Viscount Roger II. of Beziers,—and soon became so dangerous to Church and State that Pope Innocent III. was fully justified in saying, "The Albigenses are worse than the Saracens."

To put a stop to their devastations, the Church made use of various means. Synods repeatedly opposed them by severe edicts; and ecclesiastical superiors set missions on foot for the conversion of the seduced people. Nevertheless, the heresy continued to enlarge its boundaries.

The legates Rainer and Guido were sent by Innocent III. to the south of France, where also St. Dominic began his missionary labors. They were succeeded by Raoul and Peter of Castelnau, two Cistercian monks. The latter pronounced excommunication on Raymond VI., who, contrary to his promise, favored the heretics. Soon afterwards the legate was assassinated (1208).

Innocent III. then had recourse to the king and barons of France to put an end to such disorderly proceedings, and commissioned the Abbot Arnold of Citeaux to preach a crusade, the necessity of which Count Raymond V. of Toulouse had already pointed out. A considerable army of Crusaders was soon in array, under the conduct of the brave Simon, Count of Montfort, to wage war with the principal protectors of the heretics, Raymond VI. of Toulouse, and Roger II. of Beziers. The former sought to avert the impending danger by petitioning for absolution from the excommunication. This was granted to him after he had promised, on oath at St. Gilles, to comply with the demands of the papal legate Milo.

Roger, on the contrary, who remained obstinate, was defeated by the Crusaders; and the conquered domain of the viscount was surrendered as a fief to their leader, Simon de Montfort.

After this, Raymond VI., who to save appearances had also assumed the cross, received the command to expel the Cathari from his dominions; but this he refused to do, on which account he was excommunicated by the papal legate. On this, the Count betook himself to Innocent III., who received him very kindly, and at his request released him from the ban. But on his return from Rome he resumed his ambiguous position, rejected the demands which were placed before him at Arles by the papal legate Magister

Digitized by Google

Theodosius, and secretly assisted the Cathari who were besieged in Lavaur This resulted in a combat between him and the Crusaders. At first the latter were not successful. The siege of Toulouse had to be given up, and Simon was reduced to great distress because Peter of Aragon came to the assistance of Count Raymond. But at length the Crusaders were the conquerors. Peter fell in battle, near Muret, 1213, and Simon came into possession of the whole country.

Innocent III. would willingly have preserved the paternal inheritance for the young count Raymond VII., but the King of France and the Fourth Council of the Lateran (convened in 1215) adjudged the territory to the victor, Simon de Montfort, as the lawful lord. His son Amaleric, however, ceded it to King Louis VIII.; and Louis IX., at the intercession of Pope Gregory IX., finally restored it to Count Raymond VII. as the patrimony of his father.

The sect called the Poor of Lyons, or the Leonists, is of less importance. It arose neither in the time of Pope Sylvester I., nor had it for its founder either Claudius of Turin or Agobard of Lyons; it dates from the twelfth century. The spiritual father of this sect is Peter Waldus, a rich merchant of Lyons; and from him its adherents are called Waldenses. Terrified by the sudden death of a friend, Waldus renounced the pleasures of the world, and made the study of the Scriptures (which he caused to be translated by two clergymen) his principal occupation. Subsequently he with some companions started forth as preachers of penance. The Archbishop of Lyons forbade their preaching. The new preachers of penance appealed to Pope Alexander III., but were not listened to; neither did they obtain a hearing from his successor Lucius III., who even excommunicated them as heretics in 1184. After their attempts with Innocent III. in 1212 had also failed, the Waldenses organized themselves into a sect, and to their former errors added others that were new;[1] that is, they adopted many errors of the Cathari, with

[1] Pseudo-Rein. contr. Waldenses, c. 5 (*Gretser*, xii. pp. 2, 28). The Waldenses principally attacked the Church as having from the time of Pope Sylvester I. departed from apostolic maxims, and declared the Pope to be the head of all errors. They also abused the clergy. Their sole source of faith was the Scriptures. The sectarians were divided in their views on baptism and the Eucharist. They rejected the sacrifice of the Mass, and made the validity of the sacraments depend on the worthiness of the dispenser. They rejected the sacraments of extreme unction and of matrimony, as also the ecclesiastical ceremonies, pilgrimages, purgatory, prayer for the dead, and only acknowledged three hierarchical degrees, — the episcopate, the presbytery, and the diaconate. *Denzinger*, Enchir. p. 159.

Digitized by Google

whom they now united. By their affectation of piety, their attacks on the clergy, and other means of a like description, these sectarians found followers, who were united not so much by their agreement in doctrine as by their hatred to the Church. The sect spread in southern France, particularly in Provence and in Dauphiné; it made its way also into Lombardy in the valley of the Cottian Alps; it also sought to obtain followers in Germany. In order to escape persecution, they outwardly conformed to Catholic usages, frequented the churches, and even received the Holy Eucharist. In consequence of their uniting with the Hussites, they adopted many of the errors of these latter. In the sixteenth century they joined the Protestants, whose system of teaching they then made their own. As such, they still exist in Piedmont. In the seventeenth century their writings were greatly interpolated, in order to give them the appearance of being forerunners of Luther.

§ 147. *Ecclesiastical and Spanish Inquisition.*

The Christian State could not be indifferent to the admixture of error with the divine revelation. Necessarily it was compelled to consider every attempt of this nature as an attack on the highest good possessed by the human race, and one which called for repression.[1]

Starting from this principle, which in itself is correct, the Christian Roman Emperor declared heresy to be also a crime against the State, and threatened obstinate defenders of the heresies condemned by the Church with such punishments as imprisonment, banishment, confiscation of property, and in some cases even with death. This view was predominant in the Middle Ages, and found expression in the laws of the empire, which inflicted special punishments on obstinate heretics. The amount of punishment was determined, (1) By the heinousness of the doctrine and morality taught by the sectaries; and (2) By the character of the legislation itself. From the time of the Emperor Frederic II. death by fire was the usual punishment of heresy. This punishment, which at that time was blamed by some and defended[2] by others, had its origin principally

[1] See § 48, Cod. Theod. xvi. 5, 40: "Volumus esse publicum crimen [scl. haeresis Manich. et Priscill.], quia, quod in religione divina committitur, in omnium fertur injuriam." This was so ordained by Theod. II. in the year 407.

[2] *Thom. Aquin.* II. ii. qu. 11, art. 3. "Haeretici *possunt* non solum excommunicari, sed et juste occidi."

Digitized by Google

in the danger to Church and State, essentially inherent in the heretical maxims of the sects of the Middle Ages.[1]

The decision as to whether any particular person was to be considered as an obstinate heretic was left to ecclesiastical superiors, and belonged, of its own nature, to the bishops whose special sphere of business it was to guard the purity of faith in their diocese.

As, however, in the regions of the south of France, of Upper Italy, etc., in which such dangerous heresies had been so secretly spread that ordinary means and ordinary measures did not suffice to check their destructive progress, Pope Lucius III. (after the Third Lateran Council, c. 27), at the Council of Verona, 1184, issued strict ordinances against the heretics and those who favored them, and at the same time commanded the bishops to visit their dioceses either personally or by substitute for the purpose of judicial inspection. These ordinances were repeated and rendered more severe by Pope Innocent III., especially at the Fourth Lateran Council, 1215. Yet even at this time it was not precisely a tribunal of the Inquisition that was established.

It was not till the war with the Albigenses was at an end that the ecclesiastical Inquisition was established by the Council of Toulouse (1229), which in canons 1–3 decreed that the bishops should authorize a clergyman and some laymen in every parish to watch over the parishioners and to denounce those suspected of heresy.

Before the time of Innocent IV. Dominican monks had been employed as inquisitors in particular cases; but it was this Pope who first specially intrusted them with this business, without, however, interfering with the rights of the bishops.

The duties of the office of inquisitor, which were equally burdensome and dangerous, consisted, (1) In examining whether any per-

[1] Cf. Lat. iii. c. 26: "Licet ecclesiastica disciplina, sacerdotali contenta judicio, cruentas non efficiat ultiones: catholicorum tamen principum constitutionibus adjuvatur, ut saepe quaerant homines salutare remedium, dum corporale super se metuunt evenire supplicium. Ea propter quia in Gasconia, Albegisio, et partibus Tolosanis et aliis locis, ita haereticorum, quos alii Catharos, alii Patrinos. alii Publicanos, alii aliis nominibus vocant, invaluit damnata perversitas, ut jam non in occulto, sicut aliqui, nequitiam suam exerceant, sed suum errorem publice manifestent et ad suum consensum simplices attrahant et infirmos: eos et defensores eorum et receptores, anathemati decernimus subjacere," etc. Of the devastations caused by other heretics, the same canon says: "Tantam immanitatem exercent, ut nec ecclesiis nec monasteriis deferant, non viduis et pupillis, non senibus et pueris nec cuilibet parcant aetati aut sexui sed modo paganorum omnia perdant et vastent."

Digitized by Google

son were a heretic or not; (2) In reconciling those convicted of heresy to the Church; (3) In delivering up obstinate heretics to the secular power, which pronounced the sentence against the criminal and also executed it.

As in the Middle Ages heresy was considered a more grievous crime than high-treason itself, the same sentence decreed for those convicted of high-treason fell upon those convicted of heresy. This explains many customs[1] of inquisitorial proceedings which were by no means conducted in a cruel or arbitrary manner. At the worst, the reproach of cruelty applies rather to some individual inquisitors than to the Inquisition itself, by the institution of which the number of victims was lessened, not enlarged. Besides which, the condemned had always the resource of appealing to the apostolic chair, which not only powerfully protected the innocent, but kept a watchful eye over the judicial proceedings of the inquisitors, and was ever anxious to temper their judgments by recommending milder measures.

The Ecclesiastical Inquisition is to be distinguished from the Spanish Inquisition,[2] first appointed by Ferdinand the Catholic and Isabella for Castile and afterwards extended to Aragon. This, although it may not be considered as a mere State institution, was yet dependent on the temporal rulers; its object was to break the might of the higher aristocracy and at the same time to detect and punish those who used the pretence of being converted as a mask, whether Jews (Maranos) or Mahometans (Moriscoes). The first tribunal was erected in 1481 at Seville. How little the apostolic chair approved of this institution of the State is seen by the letter of Sixtus IV. of Aug. 2, 1483.

Ferdinand would not be dissuaded from his purpose. He appointed the Dominican *Torquemada* as Grand Inquisitor of Castile, and afterwards of Aragon, to which finally the Pope consented;

[1] Cf. *Nic. Eymerici*, Directorium inquisitorum cum comment. *F. Pegna*, Rom. 1578. As in the case of high-treason, every citizen, even one without honor, or who had been guilty of the same crime, was bound to denounce heresy. The names of the witnesses were kept secret. But the accused might name his enemies, who were then excluded from giving testimony. The rack and tortures were used not only in the case of high-treason and of heresy, but for other crimes also. Confiscation of property was also the punishment of treason; many laws were passed respecting the disposition of property that had been confiscated. See *Hergenröther*, p. 587.

[2] *Llorente*, Hist. critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne. Paris, 1817. 4 vols. See p. 520, n. 1, *De Maistre*, Lettres à un gentilhomme Russe sur l'Inquisition Espagnole. 1839.

Digitized by Google

whereupon Torquemada erected four tribunals of inquisition—at Seville, Cordova, Jaen, and Villa Real (subsequently transferred to Toledo)—and sketched the statutes for the inquisitors, who were all appointed by the king. By a bull of February, 1485, Innocent VIII. confirmed the approbation already given by his predecessor.

The banishment decreed by Ferdinand in 1492 of all the Jews and Moors who refused to receive baptism, brought a number of sham Christians into the Church, and extended the sphere of action for the Inquisition. During the reign of Philip II. this institution prevented Protestantism from being smuggled into the kingdom; and during the reign of the Bourbons it was its mission to punish gross crimes against morality, to prevent the importation of infidel writings into Spain, and to confirm royal absolutism. Joseph Bonaparte abolished the Inquisition. Ferdinand VII. re-established it in 1814; but the revolutionary Cortes in 1820 renewed the suppression of its office and its power.

The accusations which the notorious *Llorente* brings against the Spanish Inquisition lose their force when the character and conduct of this man are brought under inspection. The assertions made by some learned men, that this institution was unpopular, and that it had caused the ruin of knowledge and science in Spain, are in plain contradiction to history. According to *Balmez*, in introducing the Inquisition, the Catholic rulers acted in accordance with the wishes of the people, but against those of the nobility and of the higher clergy. How little learning and knowledge were checked may be ascertained from the fact that the most flourishing era for Spanish literature falls precisely in the time of the Spanish Inquisition; while, on the other hand, the dominion of liberalism in Spain was very unfruitful in literary or scientific productions.

Again, the reproaches made respecting the regulations and the judicial proceedings of the Inquisition are either unfounded or exaggerated. The mode of carrying on the prosecution in the Inquisition was milder and more circumspect than that pursued in other courts of justice. The prisons were more cheerful than those in other countries; the rack might be used only once, while in the usual courts of justice this torture was repeated. The number of those who suffered is, on examination, proved to be greatly reduced from the usual amount given.

The "San benito" ("Saccus benedictus") corresponds to the garment of penance in use there and elsewhere. The Autos-da-fé ("Actus fidei") were not awful scenes of horror. They often

Digitized by Google

resulted in the innocent being set free, and in a penance being laid on the repentant sinner; they were rather acts of mercy than of cruelty.

It is equally unlawful and unfair to judge either the Ecclesiastical or the Spanish Inquisition according to the standard of our own century. The duty of the secular power to punish heretics was still recognized in the sixteenth century, alike by Catholics and Protestants.

On the 27th of October, 1553, Calvin had the Spanish physician Michael Servetus burnt as a heretic; and to justify himself, wrote a treatise in which he proves "jure gladii coërcendos esse haereticos." Melanchthon praises him for this execution, and writes to the Genevan reformer: "Tuo judicio prorsus assentior. Affirmo etiam, vestros magistratus juste fecisse, quod hominem blasphemum, re ordine judicata, interfecerunt" (Inter *Calv.* ep. 187). Beza, Calvin's disciple, wrote "De haereticis a civili magistratu puniendis." The so-called reformers would have subjected Catholics to civil punishments, even that of death. See, for instance, *Melanchthon* (Corp. reform. ed. *Bretschneider*, ix. 77), and *Calvin* (Ep. Genev. 1579, p. 40). How Protestant princes treated their Catholic subjects will be shown in § 165 sqq. The immoral principle "Cujus regio illius et religio" was set up by the German States of the Empire, and followed out.

§ 148. *John Wycliffe and his Heresy.*

About the middle of the fourteenth century the Church of England, which until then had kept itself free from heresy, was seriously threatened in that respect by John Wycliffe, whose heresy seemed to embrace and conciliate every element of false philosophy and theology then current throughout the whole Church of the West.[1]

He was born at the village of Wycliffe, in Yorkshire, in 1324, and studied philosophy, theology, and law at Oxford, where the celebrated though ofttimes erring Thomas Bradwardine was teaching; here he acquired fame for extensive knowledge and acumen. Wycliffe had already showed signs of ill-will to Rome, when in the year 1360 he entered vehemently into the controversy which the University of Oxford was carrying on against the Mendicant Orders, and soon assumed a position hostile to the Apostolic See. When, in 1365, Urban V. sent to demand from King Edward III. the feudal tribute which had been paid to Rome from the time of John Lackland, Parliament decided against the payment, as unlawful in

[1] *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vi. 810 sqq. The work of the Superintendent and Professor *Lechler*, "Wycliffe and History before the Reformation," Leipsic, 1873, is a one-sided glorification of Wycliffe, Huss, etc. *Stevenson*, The Truth about J. Wyclif.

Digitized by Google

itself, dangerous to the independence of England, and contrary to the coronation oath taken by the king. This parliamentary decision was eagerly taken up and defended by Wycliffe; and thus he gained the favor of the crown. This, in 1372, obtained for him the degree of Doctor; and he became professor of theology at Oxford, to which, in 1375, the rectory of Lutterworth was added.

In the mean time a new accusation was brought forward against the Papal See, respecting the collation of benefices in England. Wycliffe was one of the royal commissioners sent to Bruges in 1374, to confer with the papal legates on the pending questions. While on this mission he was informed of the disorderly state of affairs at the Papal Court of Avignon: and when he returned to England he used every exertion in vehemently denouncing the Mendicant Orders, the clergy, the hierarchy, and more especially the Pope, against whom he declaimed in very abusive language.

The English hierarchy could not remain silent. At the instance of William Courtnay, Bishop of London, Wycliffe was summoned to appear before a synod held in February, 1377. He appeared in the company of Duke John of Ghent, son of Edward, whose friendship he had acquired at Bruges, and in that of Lord Percy, Earl Marshall. Their rude and boisterous behavior interfered with the proceedings of the synod, which therefore contented itself with enjoining silence on Wycliffe,—an injunction with which he did not comply.

The opponents of Wycliffe sent nineteen propositions, drawn from his letters, writings, and sermons, to Pope Gregory XI., who, on May 22, 1377, ordered a new examination into the matter.

Soon after the bull of the Pope arrived in England, King Edward III. died (June 21). The Duke of Lancaster (John of Ghent) became regent, as guardian of Richard II., then a minor. Therefore the order of the Pope could not immediately be carried into effect. The heretic became bolder; and to the question asked by the Government, whether it was allowable to forbid the exportation of money from the kingdom even when threatened with ecclesiastical censures, he resolutely replied in the affirmative.

At the beginning of the year 1378 the examination that had been commanded took place in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, at which Wycliffe appeared; but, owing to intimidation, the bishops contented themselves with enjoining silence on him, who meantime had given to his declarations a more reserved and somewhat sophistical interpretation.

Digitized by Google

But neither admonition nor reproach availed to change the disposition of Wycliffe. The deplorable schism that broke out in 1378 offered him the opportunity he desired, and which he used under the mask of zeal for the Church, to calumniate the Holy See. His ill-feeling towards Rome soon developed into opposition to the Church generally. Without knowledge of Greek and Hebrew, he began, in 1380, to translate the Bible into English, omitting the deutero-canonical books. He declared the Bible to be the only source of faith, denied the freedom of the will, and the dogma of transubstantiation. Further, he defended the doctrine of unqualified predestination, and taught that the papacy and episcopacy are not of divine institution; nay, he went so far as to say that all power, spiritual as well as temporal, is dependent on the state of grace, and that the Church is only the communion of the predestined.

The teachings of the reformer, whose disciples, — among whom were the communistic preachers, Jack Straw and John Ball, — clad in coarse garments ("russetum"), went up and down the country preaching the new doctrines, soon bore their fruit. These revolutionary sermons of John Wycliffe's adherents excited the insurrections of the peasants in 1381, which were suppressed by the energy of Richard II.

When William Courtnay, Bishop of London, was raised to the archbishopric of Canterbury, he, in May, 1382, convoked a provincial synod at London, at which twenty-four articles, drawn from the writings of Wycliffe and the sermons of his followers, were condemned, — ten as heretical and fourteen as erroneous.[1] The archbishop had the decision solemnly proclaimed, after which it

[1] The propositions condemned as heretical were: "(1) Quod substantia panis materialis et vini maneat post consecrationem in sacramento altaris. (2) Item, quod accidentia non maneant sine subjecto post consecrationem in eodem sacramento. (3) Item, quod Christus non sit in sacramento altaris identice, vere et realiter in propria praesentia corporali. (4) Item, quod si episcopus vel sacerdos exsistat in peccato mortali, non ordinat, conficit, nec baptizat. (5) Item, quod si homo fuerit debite contritus omnis confessio exterior est sibi superflua vel inutilis. (6) Item pertinaciter asserere non esse fundatum in evangelio, quod Christus Missam ordinaverit. (7) Item, quod Deus debet obedire diabolo. (8) Item, quod si Papa sit praestigiator et malus homo ac per consequens membrum diaboli, non habet potestatem supra fideles Christi ab aliquo sibi datam nisi forte a Cesare. (9) Item, quod post Urbanum VI. non est aliquis recipiendus in Papam, sed vivendum est more Graecorum sub legibus propriis. (10) Item asserere, quod est contra sacram scripturam, quod viri ecclesiastici habeant possessiones temporales." On this synod, cf. *Harduin*, tom. vii. p. 1899 sq. *Mansi*, tom. xxvi. p. 695.

Digitized by Google

received the sanction of the civil authority. Wycliffe tried to regain the favor of the court by his petition to Parliament, in which, among other things, he called upon the crown to confiscate the goods of the Church. But he did not attain his end. He was deprived of his professorship at a second synod (that of Oxford, Nov. 18, 1382), and withdrew to his parish, Lutterworth. Here he preached frequently, and composed his principal work, entitled "Trialogus," in four books; in which he introduces Truth, Falsehood, and Prudence (Aletheia, Pseudis, Phronesis) in conversation one with the other,[1] and develops his doctrinal system, which is a composite of gross pantheistic realism, fatalism, and predestinationism.

On Dec. 28, 1384, he was present at the Mass said by his chaplain John Purney, when, at the time of consecration, he was struck by apoplexy, deprived of the use of his tongue and of his limbs, and three days afterwards (December 31), was a corpse. He had made no recantation, had not complied with a summons inviting him to Rome, but, on the contrary, occupied himself to the last in developing his system and defending his errors.

The sect did not die out with the death of the founder; on the contrary, it was increased by the zeal with which itinerant preachers went about distributing their Bibles and their pamphlets, and in the very spirit of Wycliffe declaiming against the ruling Church and the clergy. They and their followers were called Lollards. Many of them were clownish, unmannerly advocates of revolution. At their head stood Nicholas Hereford, Doctor of Theology at Oxford, with whom John of Aston, parish priest in the diocese of Worcester, coalesced. Then came John Purney, Wycliffe's most intimate friend and chaplain, John Parker, Robert Swinderly, William Smith, and others. The principal seats of the Wycliffites at first were the dioceses of London and Lincoln, then of Worcester and Salisbury. In 1388 a royal mandate commanded that the Wycliffite writings should be delivered up, but this produced little effect. Henry IV., with the Parliament, took more energetic measures against the sectaries than Richard II. had done. Their errors were condemned, also, at a Roman Synod under John XXIII. and at the Council of Constance.[2] The condemnation of forty-five articles of Wycliffe was confirmed by Martin V.

[1] Ed. Frcfrt. et Leips. 1753. Concerning his other works, see *Lewis*, who writes from a Protestant point of view. Cf. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vi.

[2] Cf. *Denzinger*, Enchiridion, p. 186 sqq. *Thomas Waldensis* (+ 1431), Provincial of the Carmelites and private secretary of Henry V., in an excellent dogmatical work

Digitized by Google

John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, was a strong upholder of the Wycliffites, and an obstinate defender of their errors. For a long time he enjoyed the favor of Henry IV.; but, having organized a conspiracy, he was finally taken prisoner and condemned to death, under Henry V., in 1417. From that time forth the sect of the Lollards withdrew more and more from the public view; many of them had been burnt as heretics, and gradually they were almost entirely suppressed.

§ 149. *The Heresy of John Huss.*

John Huss, an ardent defender of the errors of Wycliffe, was born at Husinecz in 1369. He was a professor at the university, and a Bohemian preacher at the Church of Bethlehem, in Prague, who made use of his office in both these capacities to spread these errors in learned and unlearned circles.[1] While proclaiming these errors he took occasion to make the most odious attacks on the clergy, whose shortcomings he assailed in the most unsparing and exaggerated manner. The disorders in Prague and the dissensions between the Germans and the Slavonians (Czechs) in the university, which had been founded in 1348, favored the views of the Bohemian heretic, who also undertook to play the part of a reformer. Huss found many adherents among the Czechs, with whose nationality he identified the purpose he had in hand.

The censure of the forty-five propositions of Wycliffe by the university in 1408, and the prohibition issued by the Archbishop Sbinko (Zbynek) against reading the writings of Wycliffe, inflamed still more the wrath of the Czechian reformer against the Germans, who had been instrumental in procuring the judicial reprobation of Wycliffe's propositions by the university; and he now set every lever in motion to throw the preponderance of power on the side of the Czechs. In this he succeeded. By a decree of the 18th of January, 1409, King Wenceslaus, contrary to existing regulations, granted three votes to the Czechs, and to the other nations — namely, to the Saxon, Bavarian, and Polish — but one. In con-

refuted the heresy of Wycliffe. Cf. *Thomas Waldensis*, Doctrinale antiquitat. eccl. Cath. Ed. Venet. 1757 sqq. 3 vols. fol. To him are also ascribed the "Fasciculi Zizaniorum magistri J. Wyclif cum tritico (ed. *Schirley* in Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores)." Lond. 1858.

[1] Hist. et monumenta *J. Hus et Hieron. Prag.* Norimb. 1558. Ed. ii. 1715. 2 vols. Documenta M. J. Hus, ed. *Palacky*. Prag. 1869. *Hefele*, Hist. of the Councils, vol. vii. Division 1.

Digitized by Google

sequence of this injustice thirty thousand students left Prague; and the university, renowned hitherto as belonging to the world, sank into a Czechian institution, the university of a single country.

In order to nullify beforehand the probable censures of the Pope, Huss and his followers induced the king to renounce obedience to Gregory XII., and to give in his adherence to the Council of Pisa. This took place shortly after the issue of the above-named decree.

Encouraged by these results, Huss, who on every occasion showed himself a bitter enemy of the Germans, now proceeded in a still more reckless way against the clergy, while he publicly and unreservedly preached the erroneous ideas of Wycliffe, whose "Trialogus" he had already translated into the Bohemian language.

The heretic endeavored to escape from the censures of the archbishop by an appeal to the Pope of Pisa, Alexander V.; but this Pope confirmed the judgment of Sbinko, on which the archbishop commanded that the Wycliffian writings should be delivered up, and the preaching of Huss suppressed in the subordinate churches. Huss surrendered the writings, but protested against the suppression of his preaching, and brought a complaint against his ecclesiastical superior, before John XXIII., the successor of Alexander.

The archbishop's command to burn the heretical writings had caused considerable excitement among the heretical Czechs, which assumed a more serious character under Archbishop Albik; but it was the publication of the crusade bull which John XXIII. had issued against Ladislaus of Naples, that called forth their indignation and aroused their fury. Huss also preached with great vehemence against the bull of Indulgence, which his followers, with Jerome of Prague, first held up to the mockery of the vulgar, and then publicly committed to the flames.

The immoderate vehemence of Huss — who was now opposed even by his former Czechian friends, Stanislaus and Peter of Znaim, Stephen of Palecz, with Andrew of Broda, and others — brought upon him the excommunication of John XXIII., who at the same time laid Prague under an interdict for so long as the heretic should remain in the place.

Huss left Prague in December, 1412, at the command of King Wenceslaus, appealing the while from the judgment of the Pope to that of Christ; thenceforth he took up his abode at the castles of his friends among the nobility. Here he composed several works, particularly his principal theological treatise, "Tractatus de Ecclesia."

Digitized by Google

According to the confused and self-contradictory assertions of Huss, the Church is the congregation of the predestinated; reprobates belong to the Church only exteriorly. The only head is Christ; therefore the Church does not need the papacy. St. Peter was not elected by Christ as the fundamental rock of his Church, and the Roman Bishop owes his dignity to the imperial favor which he has enjoyed since the time of Constantine the Great.[1] The Pope and the bishops are therefore the true representatives of God, and the successors of Peter and of the Apostles, only when their conduct corresponds to the divine law; and their ordinances have the force of law only when they are conformable to the ordinances of God.[2]

It would follow from this, that the subject, although inferior, has the right to examine the commands of the superior, as to whether such commands correspond to the commands of God or not; in the first case obedience becomes a duty, but in the latter resistance is a holy obligation.

This applies not only to ecclesiastical superiors, but to the secular authority in like manner, as every power is dependent on being in a state of grace.[3]

It cannot therefore be affirmed that the Pope is the head of the Church, since, if he be a reprobate, he is not even a member of it.

A pious priest who possesses the requisite knowledge for the office, and feels himself impelled to preach the Word of God, may do so in utter disregard of the censures of the Church; for suspension and interdict are null and void before God. Ecclesiastical obedience is altogether an invention of the priests, against the express decision of Holy Writ, which Huss declared to be the only source of faith.

With respect to the Most Holy Eucharist, Huss does not seem

[1] Among the assertions of Huss censured by the Council of Constance, are the following: "Unica est sancta universalis ecclesia, quae est praedestinatorum universitas (1). Petrus non est, nec fuit caput Ecclesiae sanctae Catholicae (7). Papalis dignitas a Caesare inolevit, et Papae perfectio et institutio a Caesaris potentia emanavit (9). Non est scintilla apparentiae, quod oporteat esse unum caput in spiritualibus regens Ecclesiam, quod semper cum Ecclesia ipsa militante conversetur et conservetur (27)."

[2] "Nemo gerit vicem Christi vel Petri, nisi sequatur eum in moribus: cum nulla alia sequela sit pertinentior, nec aliter recipiat a Deo procuratoriam potestatem; quia ad illud officium vicariatus requiritur et morum conformitas et instituentis auctoritas (12)." Cf. prop. 13, 14.

[3] "Nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est Praelatus, nullus est Episcopus, dum est in peccato mortali (30)."

Digitized by Google

to have adopted the doctrine of Wycliffe. On the other hand, he denies the priest the power to absolve from sin, conceding to him only the office of announcing that God has remitted the penitent's sins.

After the resignation of Albik, Conrad of Vechta became Archbishop of Prague. He was not more successful than had been his predecessor in quieting the disturbances that had arisen. In order to restore peace, the German king Sigismund, with the consent of Wenceslaus, cited the obstinate heretic, who had continued to preach nothwithstanding the ecclesiastical inhibition, to appear before the Fathers assembled in council at Constance, in order to defend himself. Huss, who had already appealed to an œcumenical council, agreed to this willingly, and set out for Constance, being provided with a letter of safe-conduct from King Sigismund; and here too came his two adversaries, Professor Stephen of Palecz and the parish priest Michael Deutchbrod, commonly called *De Causis.*

At first the council treated the heretic very mildly. John XXIII. even permitted him to attend divine service. He was, however, still under suspension, in spite of which he continued to celebrate Mass and to preach his errors. It was this disobedience that was the principal cause of his arrest. Huss was taken to the Dominican Monastery, which place of abode was afterwards exchanged for the Castle Gottlieben, and subsequently for the monastery of the Minorites.

After a long preliminary examination the public trial of Huss took place on the 5th, 7th, and 8th of June. The greater part of the propositions taken from his writings he acknowledged as his; others he repudiated as forgeries or as adulterated. Hereupon the council rejected the heretical opinions of Huss, who nevertheless refused to revoke them, on which account he was, on the 6th of July, degraded from his sacerdotal dignity, and handed over to the secular power for punishment. Once again did Sigismund attempt to prevail on him to recall his errors. Huss continued immovable; he declared the council to be an assembly of Pharisees, and died at the stake, with a fortitude worthy of a better cause, on the 16th of July, 1415. His friend Jerome of Prague underwent the same fate on the 30th of May, 1416.

After the death of Huss the formidable Hussite war broke out. A considerable number of Bohemian noblemen, who coveted the goods of the Church, united with the Hussite Czechs. They formed a powerful party, whose device was to demand the cup for the laity,

Digitized by Google

— in other words, Holy Communion under both species, — which requirement, though Huss had not been the one to introduce it, he had approved.

Nicholas of Husinecz and John Ziska were at the head of the rebels. On the 30th of July, 1419, the insurrection broke out in Prague with the procession of the chalice. The Hussite-Bohemian party, who shortly before had held a very numerous assembly on Tabor, a city and fortress founded on the hill Hardisstin by Nic of Husinecz as a centre for the extreme Hussites, took possession of the capital, and committed the well-known atrocities in the court-house. This was followed by the plundering of the churches and by the persecution and expulsion of the Catholic clergy, whose places were filled by the Utraquists.

After the death of Wenceslaus the condition of the Catholics in Bohemia became even worse. The Hussites refused to acknowledge Sigismund as king, and under the lead of Ziska (+ 1424) invaded the adjoining countries. The efforts of Sigismund and of Pope Martin V. were in vain; the crusaders were defeated, and the negotiations with the Hussites were again broken off because the Church could not consent to the demands of Ziska, — (1) Free preaching of the pure gospel; (2) Communion under both species ("sub utraque"); (3) Renunciation of all worldly possessions on the part of the clergy; (4) Punishment of mortal sin, whether committed by clergy or laity, by the secular power.

The bloody strife began over again; but after the death of Ziska the divisions of the rebels among themselves brought some of them after a while to desire reconciliation with the Church. They had separated into Taborites under Procope the Elder, and Orphans (those who had lost their father in Ziska) under Procope the Younger; into the Horebites and the Calixtines of Prague. To these were added divers Manichæan sects (Adamites), who had settled in Bohemia. Wrought upon by the disasters occasioned by these divisions, the more moderate Hussites, called Calixtines, or Utraquists, were finally induced to seek reconciliation with the Church. For this purpose, after long consultations, they sent deputies to the Council of Basle, among whom were Procope the Elder and the Calixtinian Rokyczana; but after long and protracted debates the Bohemian ambassadors left the council without having come to any definite result. The synod, however, sent legates to Bohemia; and these, on the 30th of November, 1433, finally succeeded in bringing about the union with the Hussites, which is called the Compact of

Digitized by Google

Prague. The four articles above enumerated were accepted with some modifications. The Church permitted Holy Communion under both species to the Utraquists, who on their side promised to believe and to teach that the reception of the Holy Eucharist under both species was not necessary to the full efficacy of the Sacrament. The third article was so far modified as to decree that the property of the Church should be used according to the precept of the Church. In regard to the first article the preaching was to be under the superintendence of the bishop; and the fourth article was modified into the proposition that mortal sin should be punished by those who had legitimate authority so to do.

The Taborites were not satisfied with this treaty; but on the 30th of March, 1434, they suffered a complete defeat at Böhmischbrod. Sigismund was now universally acknowledged as king; and by the Treaty of Iglau, 1436, the Compact of Prague obtained the force of law. Yet, herewith, peace was not altogether restored.

The Bohemian Brethren sprang up from the Utraquists in Bohemia and Moravia. Their first head was Michael Bradacz, Utraquist parish priest at Zamberg. The members of this sect, who wished to restore the Church to its ancient simplicity, rejected transubstantiation and some other dogmas. The sect spread throughout Germany, principally, however, in Saxony. At a later period its adherents made common cause with the Protestants.

I. The charge made against Sigismund of not having kept the word he had given to Huss, inasmuch as the royal letter of safe-conduct was violated by the condemnation and chastisement of the holder of that letter, is utterly unfounded; for Sigismund neither would nor could grant the heretic a safe-conduct in the sense of perfect freedom and impunity.

1. The truth of this assertion is proved by the very letter itself, which runs thus: "Sigismundus Dei gratia Romanorum rex . . . universis et singulis principibus, ecclesiasticis et secularibus, ducibus, marchionibus, comitibus, nobilibus, proceribus, ministerialibus, militibus, clientibus, capitaneis, potestatibus, gubernatoribus, praesidibus, teleonariis, tributariis et officialibus quibuscunque, civitatum, oppidorum, villarum et locorum communitatibus ac rectoribus eorundem ceterisque nostris et imperii sacri subditis ac fidelibus, ad quos praesentes pervenerint, gratiam regiam et omne bonum. Venerabiles, illustres et fideles dilecti! Honorabilem magistrum Johannem Huss, sacrae theologiae baccalaureum formatum et artium magistrum, praesentium ostensorem, de regno Bohemiae ad concilium generale in civitate Constantiensi in proximo transeuntem, quem etiam in nostram et sacri imperii protectionem recepimus et tutelam, vobis omnibus et vestrum cuilibet pleno recommendamus affectu, desiderantes, quatenus ipsum, dum ad vos pervenerit, grato suscipere, favora-

Digitized by Google

biliter tractare, ac in his, quae celeritatem ac securitatem ipsius concernunt itineris, tam per terram quam per aquam, promotivam sibi velitis et debeatis ostendere voluntatem, nec non ipsum cum famulis, equis valisiis [portmanteau, valise] et aliis rebus suis singulis per quoscunque passus, portus, pontes, terras, dominia, districtus, jurisdictiones, civitates, oppida, castra, villas, et quaelibet loca alia vestra sine aliquali solutione datii [toll or taxes] pedagii [travelling fee] tributi et alio quovis solutionis onere omnique prorsus impedimento remoto transire, stare, morari et redire libere permittatis, sibique et suis, dum opus fuerit, de securo et salvo velitis et debeatis providere conductu ad honorem et reverentiam nostrae regiae majestatis. Datum Spirae anno domini MCCCCXIIII. XVIII. die Octobris regnorum nostrorum anno Hungariae, etc. XXXIII. Romanorum vero V. Ad mandatum Domini regis: Michael de Prziest canonicus Vratislaviensis." (Documenta, p. 237.)

a. Even the heading of this document, addressed as it is to the spiritual and temporal princes and officials of Germany, and not to the members of the council, contradicts the interpretation put upon the articles it contains by the accusers of Sigismund.

b. The wording of the safe-conduct likewise bears witness that the king only granted to Huss protection against unlawful power and exemption from tolls and expenses by the way; not a syllable indicates that Sigismund intended to withdraw him from the jurisdiction of the council.

c. Although the words in the safe-conduct stand thus, "Ipsum . . . transire, stare, morari, et *redire* permittatis," this is but a usual formula, which has no special significance in this case, and certainly is not intended to restrict the authority of the lawful judge.

d. The letter of safe-conduct can so little be explained as an assurance of impunity, that in it there is not the slightest allusion made to any process by law nor to any judicial act. Besides which, Huss was not summoned to appear before the council; he went to Constance of his own free-will, in order to set the Bohemians free from any suspicion of heresy.

e. Lastly, for the due interpretation of this safe-conduct, it is well to remember that the Fathers of the council passed sentence on John XXIII., and had him arrested and deposed, although he was in possession of a safe-conduct from Sigismund and from the imperial city Constance; and this without John XXIII. or any other person complaining of any violation of the safe-conduct.

f. This safe-conduct of John Huss was, according to its contents, neither more nor less than a passport, which had no power to prevent the council or any other proper authority from bringing the holder of it to justice, or from punishing him if convicted of crime.

2. This acceptation of the letter of safe-conduct is corroborated by some important facts: —

a. The legislation of the Middle Ages, both civil and ecclesiastical, was based on the principle that the Church has the right to pass judgment on and punish a heretic.

b. How greatly Huss himself was imbued with this principle is seen from

Digitized by Google

(the invitation he addressed to his adversaries to suffer a like "pein" (torture), and from the expression that he wished "ignis incendio emendare," in case he should be found guilty.) When at a later period he wrote from Constance that Sigismund should, in reference to his letter of safe-conduct, declare to the Fathers of Constance: "Si ergo ipse [Huss] non vult pati decisionem Concilii, ego remittam eum Regi Bohemiae cum sententia vestra et attestationibus, ut ipse cum suo clero ipsum dijudicet," it is manifest here, that he does not interpret the safe-conduct in the sense of perfect impunity, but only asks to be judged in Bohemia, where, however, the same laws against heretics existed as were found elsewhere, and where even several judgments had already been passed against Huss.

3. (Sigismund demanded that the heretic should submit to the decisions of the council at Constance, and declared on that point: "Nullum volo haereticum defendere, imo si unus vellet in sua haeresi esse pertinax, ego solus vellem succendere et comburere ignem." The king could not have spoken thus if he had promised John Huss perfect impunity, either by the letter of safe-conduct or by word of mouth through Henry Leffl.

4. The interpretation of the letter in the sense given above has its foundation in the nature of things. Huss wished to defend his doctrine before the council to which he belonged, both as priest and on account of his appeal. In this case he could do no other than submit to their decision, and could not appeal to a higher tribunal. If then Sigismund had at that time assured the heretic of perfect exemption from punishment, he would then have (*a*) far exceeded his authority, (*b*) have rendered it impossible to bring the controversy to an end, and (*c*) have fostered the fire of discord.

5. Finally, (the Bohemian adherents of Huss only complain of the arrest of Huss, *before* his public trial, as a violation of the safe-conduct,) remarking expressly that Huss, "si convictus fuerit, pertinaciter aliquid contra scripturam sacram et veritatem asserere, quod id juxta decisionem et instructionem concilii debeat emendare." (Documenta, p. 257.)

6. But the letter of safe-conduct was not violated even by the arrest and imprisonment of Huss, because (*a*) It was customary to keep under arrest those who were being prosecuted for heresy; (*b*) (By his conduct in Constance, in disregarding the suspension under which he was placed, and in diffusing his errors, Huss had forfeited his right to the safe-conduct given him by Sigismund.) Moreover, the letter of safe-conduct did certainly not give permission to the heretic to commit again, on his journey to Constance, the same crimes which he had previously committed at Prague.

II. The assertion that (the council decreed that it was allowed to break one's word to a heretic is best disproved by the words of the decree,) which runs thus: "Praesens sancta Synodus ex quovis salvo conductu, per imperatorem, Reges et alios saeculi Principes haereticis vel de haeresi diffamatis, putantes eosdem sic a suis erroribus revocare, quocunque vinculo se astrinxerint, concesso, nullum fidei catholicae vel jurisdictionis ecclesiasticae praejudicium generari, vel impedimentum praestari posse seu debere, declarat, quominus

Digitized by Google

salvo dicto conductu non obstante liceat judici competenti ecclesiastico de hujus modi personarum erroribus inquirere, et alias contra eas debite procedere, easdemque punire, quantum justitia suadebit, si suos pertinaciter recusaverint revocare errores, etiamsi de salvo conductu confisi ad locum venerint judicii alias non venturi; nec sic promittentem, *cum alias fecerit quod in ipso est*, ex hoc in aliquo remansisse obligatum."

This decree thus declares only that a letter of safe-conduct given by the temporal power is no hindrance to ecclesiastical authority (1) In instituting an investigation regarding the heresy of a man, and (2) In punishing convicted heretics who persist in their heresy. In this the council does not maintain that the person who confers a safe-conduct has no obligations towards the person on whom it is conferred; on the contrary, such obligations are clearly and pointedly expressed in the words printed in italics, concerning all matters which are not contrary to the rights of the Church.

The other edict cited by Gieseler, "De salvo conductu," is spurious, and is only found in the "Codex Dorrianus" at Vienna.

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

§ 150. *The Holy Eucharist.—Penance.*

In order to express clearly and with precision the ancient Catholic doctrine concerning the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, by the change effected in the substance of the bread and wine through the words of consecration, the Fourth Council of the Lateran first affirmed the word "transubstantiation," which had been already in vogue among the scholastics, and is appropriately used for this particular purpose.

From the twelfth century the elevation of the consecrated Host during Mass was introduced, and a signal on the bell given. The custom of giving Communion to children gradually ceased. To protect the sacred blood from irreverent treatment, Holy Communion under one species only then became a general custom. According to the determination of the Council of Florence, the Greeks were to celebrate the Eucharist in leavened bread, the Latins in unleavened. The Slavic and Mozarabian liturgies were, from the time of Gregory VII., superseded by the Roman.

In 1245 Bishop Robert, incited thereto by a vision of St. Juliana of Liege, introduced a special feast in honor of the Blessed Sacrament ("Festum corporis Christi"), which in consequence of a miracle being worked at a Mass celebrated in Bolsena, near

Digitized by Google

Orvieto (1264), was sanctioned for the whole Church by Pope Urban IV. In 1311 Pope Clement V. at Vienne fixed the Thursday after Trinity Sunday for the day of its celebration. His successor John XXII. is said to have instituted the procession with the Blessed Sacrament in 1317. St. Thomas Aquinas wrote the magnificent office of the Feast, and the hymns, "Pange lingua gloriosi," "Sacris solemniis," "Verbum supernum," "Adoro te devote latens Deitas," with the sequence "Lauda Sion Salvatorem," which last is famed alike for dogmatical precision and poetical perfection. This indeed may be said of the hymns and of the office also, which excel in dogmatical equally as in æsthetical respects.

With respect to the sacrament of penance, the Fourth Lateran Council (canon 21) commanded all the faithful who had come to years of discretion, to confess their sins at least once a year to their parish priest, or with his permission to some other priest.[1]

From this canon it is obvious that confession had always been in the Church, and was not introduced at this juncture. This is also attested by the unanimous voice of Christian antiquity as to the institution of confession being of divine origin.[2]

Public penances were still practised at this epoch. They gradually, however, become more unfrequent, and at length ceased entirely. Absolution for secret sins was given to the contrite penitent before satisfaction had been made. The conscientious administration of the sacrament of penance was strictly enjoined on the pastors of souls by the synods. For the confessions of the clergy very definite directions were given.

How earnestly the Church regarded the confession of venial sins may be known by the numerous examinations of conscience put forth at this period which are still extant.

The father confessor was allowed to commute the canonical penances into fasting, pilgrimages, and almsgiving. In like manner penances were shortened or entirely remitted by indulgences,[3] plenary and partial, which were now more frequently conceded than they had been formerly. They could also be applied to the dead.[4]

[1] "Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis, postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, omnia sua solus peccata confiteatur fideliter saltem semel in anno proprio sacerdoti . . . si quis autem alieno sacerdoti voluerit justa de causa confiteri peccata, licentiam prius postulet et obtineat a proprio sacerdote," etc.

[2] See § 35.

[3] *Thom. Aquin.* Supplem. (p. iii.) quaest. 25.

[4] Cf. *Thom. Aquin.* in iv. dist. c. 45, quaest. 2, art. 3.

Digitized by Google

Under Boniface VIII. the first centenary Jubilee, with the indulgences attached to it, was introduced in the year 1300. In order to participate in the blessings promised, hundreds of thousands of men undertook the toilsome journey to Rome as pilgrims from all parts of the known world; and, notwithstanding the immense number attracted thus to the Eternal City, the greatest order prevailed. The Jubilee celebration was to be renewed after the lapse of every century; but Clement VI. shortened the time to every fiftieth year, Urban VI. to every thirty-third, and Paul II. to every twenty-fifth year.

The impediment of consanguinity to marriage was limited to the first four degrees. Publication preceded marriage. The marriage was to take place in the church before the parish priest of the bridal people ("parochus proprius"). Clandestine marriages were forbidden.[1] The "closed or forbidden time" reached from Septuagesima Sunday to the Octave of Easter, and from the first Sunday in Advent to the Octave of the Epiphany.

During a fearful plague in the thirteenth century the so-called Flagellants arose into being. These were a band of enthusiasts who, proceeding from a quite correct view, saw in the calamities of the age the chastisements of God for the sins of the people, and sought to avert the wrath of God by practices of extreme penitential severity. The first procession of Flagellants took place in Perugia in 1260; but between 1348 and 1350, in consequence of the Black Plague, numerous troops of such deluded enthusiasts went about, scourging themselves. Later on, the boisterous conduct and heretical tendencies of many Flagellants called forth strong measures on the part of the Inquisition, which resulted in the suppression of such processions by authority of the Church.

The Inquisition also took strong measures against the so-called Dancers (St. Guy's or St. John's Dancers), who committed great excesses on the Rhine, in the Netherlands, in Alsatia, etc., in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

§ 151. *Churches and their Ornamentation. — Religious Art.*

The depth of religious feeling in the Middle Ages is manifested in a manner not to be mistaken by the majestic worship then

[1] Lateran IV. can. 50, 51. The ecclesiastical legislation on marriages was not carried into effect among the Slaves until the twelfth century.

Digitized by Google

offered up, — a worship which was by no means a merely outward demonstration, but was, on the contrary, a plastic representation of the mysteries of faith, the profound depths of which were in some measure laid open, as it were, to the human spirit, by scholasticism and mysticism.

For the worthy celebration of the sacred mysteries, clerics and laymen vied with each other in erecting magnificent churches, which bear witness to the ardent faith of those who contributed the material means for their erection and of those who devised the grand architectural designs. In ecclesiastical architecture the Roman or round-arch style, and from the middle of the twelfth century the Germanic, also called the Gothic or pointed-arch, was used. The time in which the latter chiefly flourished was in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The former style is an expression of heavenly repose and perfection; the latter symbolizes the longing aspiration of humanity to the celestial Jerusalem.

It was towards the end of the Middle Ages that the so-called Renaissance took place. This was practically a return to the lore of antiquity, and fitly symbolizes the restless and inconstant spirit of the world, which seeks to intrude itself into the very sanctuary of the Church.

The inner and outward ornamentation of the churches corresponded to the style in which they were built, whether Roman or Gothic. The smallest ornament stands in perfect harmony with the whole; and, besides this, each object is perfect in itself.

The ground plan of the churches was then, what formerly it had also been, — the cross. The main entrance was through a portal adorned with pictorial scenes from biblical history; symbolical images and sculptured leaves and blossoms of plants, — the emblematic signs of some truth. The surface of the walls inside the church, and the glass windows, were frequently adorned with pictorial representations of scenes from the Bible or from the lives of the saints. The high towers (at least in the countries north of the Alps; in Italy the cupola being more in vogue) which pointed to heaven formed the crowning glory of the whole edifice, on the outside of which were delineated various ornaments of animals and plants, but also of fantastical figures, such as dragons and demons, to signify that the Church of God ruled over the whole material world, and was the conqueror of spirits.

At first it was chiefly the monks who attended to church building; afterwards the laity took their share therein. The brotherhood

Digitized by Google

of Masons, which was organized in the fourteenth or fifteenth century, had its origin as a religious institution.

A very particular care was expended on the providing of the necessary articles for the celebration of Mass. Many altars are real models of artistic finish. The chalice was for the most part of gold or of silver, and was frequently ornamented with precious stones and beautiful carving in relievo. The vestments for Mass — stoles, chasubles, etc. — were constructed of the most costly material, embroidered in beautiful patterns and adorned with pearls and valuable stones. The Mass-books of these times still excite the admiration of those who are connoisseurs in art.

The Holy Eucharist was preserved in vessels of gold, silver, or ivory, or even in the corporal, according to the ecclesiastical directions, and then placed in a secure position either in the church or in the sacristy. Tabernacles, monstrances, and pyxes for exposing, preserving, and carrying the Blessed Sacrament came gradually into use.

The plastic art and that of painting were alike revived by Christianity, and enlisted in the service of the Church. The plastic art produced the beautiful sculptures and bas-reliefs in stone, metal, ivory, and other material for ornamenting churches and sacred vessels; while painting exemplified the mysteries of faith, and the history appertaining to them, thereby teaching, edifying, and inspiring the minds of Christians. The real birthplace of these arts is Italy, where sculpture and painting were carried to a marvellous degree of excellence, and attained the height of perfection in the fifteenth century, from which epoch they gradually fell into decay.

Of the masters in the art of painting belonging to the School of Florence we may enumerate: Cimabue (+ 1300), Giotto (+ 1336), Masaccio (+ 1443), the angelically pure Dominican John da Fiesole (+ 1455), Dominicus Ghirlandajo (+ 1495), Leonardo da Vinci (+ 1519), Fra Bartolomeo (+ 1517), and pre-eminently Michael Angelo Buonarotti (+ 1564), who, like Giotto, was also an excellent sculptor and architect.

The most important masters of the schools of Umbria and Siena were: Peter Perugino (Vanucci, + 1524) and his great pupil Raphael Sanzio (+ 1520).

The School of Lombardy, though inferior to the preceding, was, like them, intimately connected with the Church.

Of the Venetian School the principal representatives are Correggio (+ 1534), Titian (+ 1576), and Bellini (+ 1516).

As in Italy, so in Germany, painting was used for the glory of religion. One of the most eminent works of religious art is the picture in the cathedral of Cologne, probably the production of the master Stephen (about 1410).

Digitized by Google

The representatives of the Netherland School are Hubert (+ 1426), and John van Eyck (+ 1445), who invented the mixing of colors with oil, instead of using the yolk of egg for that purpose. The celebrated Albrecht Dürer belonged to the Frankish School (+ 1528). To the Suabian School belonged Martin Schön (+ 1499), and Hans Holbein the Elder (+ 1507), and his son Hans Holbein the Younger (+ 1543).

Miniature painting was chiefly confined to the cloisters. It flourished in the fifteenth century. Two distinguished miniature-painters of Italy in the thirteenth century were Oderisi of Agubbio, and Franco of Bologna. (Cf. *Dante*, Purgatorio, xi. 79 sqq.)

Besides Giotto and Michael Angelo, the most celebrated sculptors of Italy were Nicholas of Pisa (+ 1274), James della Quercia (+ 1438), Lorenzo Ghiberti (+ 1445), who carved the two bronze gates of St. John's baptistery at Florence, and his pupil Luca della Robbia (+ 1481). The works of Donatello of Florence (+ 1466), a pupil of the celebrated architect Brunelleschi, lose a good deal of their religious character by their imitation of the pagan masters.

Germany could also boast of her sculptors in the Middle Ages, though here sculpture held a subordinate position to that of architecture. Among the names we may mention are those of Hadrian Krafft (+ 1507), a master of the Frankish School, and Peter Vischer (+ 1529), who wrought the beautiful sepulchral monument of St. Sebastian in Nüremberg.

England and France possess a very large literature on religious art. *Northcote's* Life of Titian, with Anecdotes of the Distinguished Persons of his Time. 2 vols. London, 1830. *Vasari's* Vite de' Pitton has been translated into English.

§ 152. *Church Hymns and Canticles.— Veneration of Saints.*

The faith and religious spirit of the nations in the Middle Ages are beautifully reflected in the Latin hymns and sequences,[1] as also in the religious hymns in the mother-tongue, which are alike distinguished for correct dogma and poetical elevation; these contributed not a little to enhance the solemnity of the festivals.

Before the so-called Reformation Germany already possessed a whole collection of German hymns, which were chanted by the people at the public services of the Church, at processions, pilgrimages, and the like.

[1] For instance, the simple yet exalted "Victimae paschali laudes," which is ascribed to St. Peter Damian; the lovely "Jesu dulcis memoria," of St. Bernard; the "Veni sancte spiritus," which is said to have been written by King Robert of France (+ 1031); the deeply affecting "Dies irae," of Thomas of Celano (+ about 1250); the pathetic "Stabat mater dolorosa," of Jacopone da Todi; the hymns of St. Thomas Aquinas, etc.

Digitized by Google

The Church also bestowed great care and exercised her zeal in the cultivation of the chant of the Church. John XXII. issued a special decretal[1] for this purpose. In some dioceses a particular feast was introduced in honor of the Most Holy Trinity. John XXII. (+ 1334) extended the observance of this feast to the whole Church.

The veneration of saints, especially that of the Mother of God, remained a cherished object of Christian faith and piety. Among the legends of the saints, the golden legend of the Dominican James of Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa (+ 1298), was the most noted, and was translated into all the popular languages of the West.

Learned theologians and inspired poets[2] rivalled each other in treatises, sermons, and poems in order to celebrate the name and high dignity of the heavenly Queen; in whose honor the Church instituted new feasts, — that the universal love and veneration of Mary might find a corresponding expression. The most celebrated shrine of the Blessed Virgin was Loreto.[3]

To the festivals already observed, Innocent IV. (1245) added that of the Nativity of Mary; and the Visitation of Mary, which Urban VI. raised, in 1389, to a festival of the whole Church. The feast of the Immaculate Conception of Mary, which had already been solemnized in the East for a long time, was first celebrated in 1140 by the canons of Lyons; and in despite of the vehement controversy between the Thomists and Scotists respecting the "immaculata conceptio," it still continued to spread in the West till Clement XI. ordered its celebration by the whole Church. In 1854, on December 8, Pope Pius IX. finally issued a dogmatical decision[4] respecting the article of faith on which the observance of that festival is founded.

Other feasts in honor of Mary were first introduced in particular dioceses, and at a later period were rendered obligatory for the whole Church. The rapid spread of the devotion of the Rosary and of the prayer called the Angelical Salutation (the Angelus Domini), bear witness to the high reverence entertained for the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God, in the Middle Ages.

[1] Cap. Docta sctr. patrum, etc. Extrav. comm. iii. 1.

[2] Cf. *Dante*, Parad. Cant. 33.

[3] The Holy House of Loreto, by Most Rev. *P. R. Kenrick*, D.D.

[4] The bull "Ineffabilis Deus" (Acta Pii IX. i. 597). Cf. *Passaglia*, De immac. Deiparae semper Virg. conceptu commentarius. Rom. 1854. 3 vols.

Digitized by Google

§ 153. *Various Forms of Superstition.*

The various superstitions, the practices of astrology, necromancy, witchcraft, magic, sorcery, and the like, which are neither the specific products of this epoch nor even peculiar to it, since these evils not only had a previous existence, but have continued subsequently to exist in all succeeding centuries, were nevertheless forcibly and energetically opposed by the spiritual[1] and civil authorities of the age, although they did not succeed in entirely extirpating them.

The most rigorous measures were pursued, alike by Church and State, against the sinful attempts made to practise witchcraft by the help of demons. This gave rise to the strict and severe laws enacted against magic and sorcery.

The prosecution of those accused of sorcery also took place in the civil courts up to the thirteenth century, when Pope Innocent VIII., in his bull ("Summis desiderantes affectibus") of the year 1484 assigned the examination of such cases to the spiritual courts alone. The object of the Pope in this decree was to effect a greater order in the judicial proceedings against witchcraft.

Although the processes against witches were by no means limited to Germany, but were carried on in other countries also, it is yet an historical fact that it was principally there that such cases occurred;[2] and it is equally certain that in the seventeenth century the jurisdiction against sorcery came again within the jurisdiction of the civil courts, both in Protestant and Catholic countries, and that it was prosecuted with great cruelties, and that a great number of the accused were condemned to death.

It is beyond doubt that among the victims were many innocent persons, who, overpowered by the terrible tortures inflicted on them, confessed crimes which they had never committed. On the other hand, neither the possibility of a criminal alliance with demoniac powers, nor the fact that such has at times taken place, can be denied.

The credit of having exercised an effectual opposition to the in-

[1] Against alchemy John XXII. issued a bull (c. unic. Extrav. comm. v. 6). The papal ordinances against sorcery, see L. 5, Tit. 12, De maleficis et incantoribus in VII. (Corp. jur. can. ed. *Boehmer* in Apend. p. 171 sqq).

[2] *Spee*, Cautio criminalis, Dub. 15 : "Itali certe et Hispani, qui ad speculandas res et meditandis proniores a natura videntur esse, cum non obscure videant, quam si Germanos imitari velint innumeram innocentum turbam simul abrepturi sint, recte abstinent et solis nobis urendi hanc provinciam committunt."

Digitized by Google

human procedures in trying those accused of sorcery belongs to Cornelius Loos (+ 1593), in Mentz; chiefly, however, to the Jesuits Adam Tanner (+ 1632) and Frederic von Spee (+ 1635); while the Protestant Carpzov (+ 1666) defended the prosecutions for witchcraft. At all events, such prosecutions were in vogue longer in Protestant than in Catholic Germany.

§ 154. *Christian Instruction.*

The duty of preaching and of explaining the truths of faith at the public services of the Church, by sermons and catechetical instructions, was frequently urged upon the pastors of the Church by synods[1] and bishops.

That preaching was not neglected in the Middle Ages, as has often been falsely asserted, is seen even in the formularies of the examination of conscience of this time, in which the questions occur, whether they (the faithful) have been present at the sermon

[1] "Manuale Parochialium" of the year 1255 says: "Ipsi presbyteri curati sanctae praedicationi in ecclesiis suis insistant pro viribus, ut sic et verbo praedicent et exemplo. Alioquin ultionem divinam debent admodum formidare. Ait enim Dominus ad Ezechielem prophetam; Fili hominis speculatorem dedi te domui Israel. Audiens ergo ex ore meo sermonem annunciabis," etc. (*Daniel*, Theol. Controversy. Halle, 1843, p. 80.) Cf. *Conc. Insulanum* [Isle near Avignon] (1251), c. 1: "Primum capitulum de fide Catholica frequenter praedicanda, scl. secundum quod in Arelatensi concilio olim noscitur constitutum" (*Harduin*, vii. 433). *Conc. Albiense* (1254), c. 17. "Praecipimus, quod sacerdotes parochiales per se vel per alios saepius studeant exponere populo diebus Dominicis et festivis articulos fidei simpliciter ac distincte . . . et ad hoc idem in sua dioecesi frequentius et diligentius faciendum quilibet episcopus sit intentus, etc. (L. c. vii. 460.) *Conc. Lambeth* (1281.) *Conc. Mogunt.* (1310). *Conc. Vaurense* (Lavaur, 1368). *Conc. Basil.* (1433) commands: "Ut hi quibus animarum cura commissa est, diebus Dominicis et aliis solemnitatibus plebem subjectam doctrinis et monitis salutaribus instruant." (*Hard.* viii. 1169). This injunction was repeated by the diocesan and provincial synods of the fifteenth century. The ascetic writings and homilies of this era also inculcate the necessity that exists that the pastors of souls should attend to the duty of preaching. *Surgant*, Manuale curat. (ed. Argent. 1506) Prolog. says: "Quilibet rector ecclesiae parochialis habet officium praedicandi de jure communi in eccl. sua per se vel alium . . . cura enim et regimen animarum praecipue in verbo Dei consistit, cum in ista instructione docetur via, per quam pergendum est ad regnum coelorum," etc. The faithful were admonished to attend the sermon diligently. Cf. *Surgant*, l. c. Consid. 4, fol. 8: "Non minus enim reus est, qui verbum Dei negligenter audierit, quam qui corpus Christi in terram cadere permiserit." A synod of York (1360) declares: "On Sunday to listen to the Word of God in the mother-tongue is better than to be present at several Masses." (*Collier*, Eccles. Hist. of Great Britain, iv. 28. Lond. 1852.) Cf. *Janssen*, Vol. I. b. 1.

Digitized by Google

and Holy Mass, and whether they have afforded those belonging to them and those dependent on them the opportunity of hearing the sermon.

A further witness for the diligent performance of the preaching office is afforded by the abundant literature of sermons handed down to us, — manuals of homilies, model sermons, preachers' lexicons, and similar works, — several editions of which are yet extant, and effectually disprove the arrogant assertion that the sermons of the Middle Ages were shallow and superficial.

Lastly, in almost every city benefices were set apart for preachers. Contemporaries bear witness, and Luther's adherents could not deny, that preaching was by no means neglected in the Middle Ages.

The Holy Scriptures were recommended to the preachers of the Middle Ages, by the Church and in homiletic instructions, as the sources whence to take their text. The sermons were delivered in the mother-tongue, though for the most part composed in Latin. During Lent it was usual to preach every day in the cities, and often in several churches; in the country there was preaching three times a week at this season. On Good Friday the history of our Lord's passion was expounded, which made the sermon of that day unusually long.

Catechetical instruction, the giving of which the Church imposed as a duty on parents, teachers, and pastors, was frequently united with the instruction given for confession, and extended to the Ten Commandments, sacraments, etc., which Christian truths were also thoroughly explained in the numerous manuals circulated; some being destined for the clergy and others for the people.

There were also popular religious books, expositions of the Gospels and Epistles (Plenaries), which, with pictorial representations from the Old and New Testaments, served to teach and edify the faithful. The Poor Man's Bible ("Biblia pauperum") made them acquainted with the principal events of the Old and New Testaments. The allegorical representations "The Art of Dying" ("Ars moriendi") and "The Dance of Death"[1] were intended to convince them of the nothingness of this life, and to direct their aspirations to the heavenly fatherland.

What is said in this paragraph may suffice to refute the bold assertion that before Luther's time the grossest ignorance prevailed among clergy and people.

[1] *Donce's* The Dance of Death. London, 1833.

Digitized by Google

Among the most eminent preachers of the Middle Ages, besides those mentioned in §§ 139–142, are the two Dominicans John of Vicenza and Jordanus of Saxony, with Berthold of Ratisbon, St. Vincent Ferrer, who combated heresy in Spain and preached penance in other places, and St. John Capistranus, who defended the faith against the Hussites and incited the Christians to fight against the Turks.

Among the preachers of the fifteenth century may be mentioned: Gabriel Barletta (about 1470), Jerome Savonarola (see § 155), Gabriel Biel, the Hungarian Franciscan Pelbart (about 1500), and Geiler of Kaisersberg († 1513), at Strasburg.

§ 155. *Moral and Religious Life.*

In considering the spiritual condition of the clergy and laity of the Middle Ages, we are reminded of the picture, in Matt. xiii. 24 sqq., drawn by our Savior, of his Church; for the political and domestic life of that time presents us at one and the same time with a brilliantly lighted picture and one of a darkly shadowed aspect.

The genuine Christian life of this period is portrayed in the Crusades; in the pilgrimages to Palestine and other holy places; in the newly founded monastic brotherhoods, the members of which met with so loving a recognition among all classes of people; in the building and adorning of innumerable churches in all parts of the Christian world; in the numerous bequests to churches and cloisters, as also in the care taken of the poor; and, lastly, in the guilds and fraternities of craftsmen, which at first bore a thoroughly religious stamp, however much, at a later period, the principle of combination for a definite purpose may have been abused.

Even the theatrical entertainments and popular amusements of the Middle Ages were pervaded by a religious spirit. The richly ascetic literature, in which the "Following of Christ" ("Imitatio Christi") holds a prominent place, served to foster and promote the true virtue of an interiorly pious life.

In the Middle Ages the number of saints who reached the highest degree of perfection is very great; but not less remarkable is the vast host of such souls, who by their lives and works present a faithful imitation of the divine example, though in a lower degree. The power and grace of God manifested themselves in an extraordinary manner in St. Hildegardis; St. Elizabeth of Thuringia; St. Angela of Foligny († 1309); in the Maid of Orleans, Joan of Arc

Digitized by Google

(+ 1431), the savior of her country, who, alas! met with so tragical an end; in St. Catherine of Siena (+ 1380), and her contemporary St. Bridget of Sweden (+ 1373), with her daughter Catherine (+ 1381), St. Catherine of Genoa (+ 1510), Nicholas of Flüe, etc.

Christian piety and Christian discipline prevailed also in the domestic life of private families, although it is not to be denied that tepidity and religious indifference had laid hold of many hearts, and taken possession of the understandings of many Christians. This was the case in the fifteenth century, more than in the preceding ages, and was mainly attributable to an obscene literature composed and spread by the Humanists. However severe a judgment may be passed on these spiritual and moral aberrations, it must at least be conceded that the disorders so strikingly manifesting the ignorance, frivolity, etc., of the age, were not by any means universal; they were but exceptions, not affecting the great majority.

How unfounded are the accusations that the Church has done nothing for the religious education of the people, and that she has withheld the Scriptures from the laity, is amply proved by the ninety-eight printed Latin editions of the Bible, and the numerous translations into the mother-tongue which were made before the appearance of Luther.[1]

Regarding the clergy, the historian may neither make use of the unreliable and inconsistent Walter von der Vogelweide or of other minnesingers, nor yet of the frivolous Humanists, as sources whence to draw his information in this respect; rather must he have recourse to the decrees of the councils, the writings of trustworthy clerics and laymen, and the undeniable facts of history: these alone will enable him to form a correct judgment.

From these historical documents it appears that a considerable number of the secular and regular clergy did not honor their State either by their learning or by their virtuous conduct, and that ecclesiastical discipline had greatly declined in many cloisters of both monks and nuns.

Impartial history informs us that this decline,[2] which has been

[1] *Geffcken*, a Protestant writer, also rejects this gross and unfounded accusation.

[2] The assertion of some historians that the decline among the clergy, regular and secular, in science and morals had incontestably been one of the chief causes of the rapid spread of Protestantism, is contrary to history, which proves that a great part of the clergy opposed an energetic resistance to the innovations of the sixteenth century. That the so-called Old Religious Orders were not in a state of general degeneration and moral depravity, as these are sometimes represented to have been at the time

Digitized by Google

greatly exaggerated, among the clergy was usually caused by disregarding the canonical laws concerning the education and appointment of bishops, and by elevating unworthy sons of the nobility to the episcopal chair or to the cathedral chapter without reference to their knowledge or capability of fulfilling the duties of their office, as also by setting at nought the ecclesiastical precepts regarding the qualifications necessary for admission into the clerical state or the monastic life, and by the want of a proper supervision of the inferior clergy on the part of their superiors.

To remedy these disorders, synods and statutes of particular bishoprics renewed their ancient ordinances concerning the deportment and conduct of the clergy, and strictly enjoined the observance of the ancient ecclesiastical laws, admonishing both the secular and regular clergy to give themselves to watchfulness, study, and prayer, while imposing severe chastisements as a penalty for not observing the laws relating to these. In the ascetic manuals particularly intended for the clergy, priests are urgently admonished to live up to their high dignity, and to perform worthily their exalted functions. Had the bishops always kept a watchful eye upon the strict observance of the ecclesiastical laws, many scandals would have been spared the Church.

Unfortunately, the disordered state of affairs in the West, the prevalence of a worldly spirit among many bishops, nay, for a time in the Apostolic See itself, greatly contributed to undermine the spiritual life of the clergy. The exile of Avignon and the great schism with its sad results impeded the execution of ecclesiastical decrees in their entire severity.

After the violent storm of the so-called Reformation, which shook off many withered leaves from the tree of life of the Church, the clergy as a body arose to a new, spiritual, and virtuous life. And even in those times when the decline had been most conspicuous, there were among the clergy, secular and regular, a considerable number of eminent men whose efforts were by no means fruitless, though powerless to avert the great catastrophe of the sixteenth century. When, in particular, the clergy of Germany are branded as models of ignorance and of moral corruption, it is placed beyond

of the Reformation, is, besides the numerous learned works of their divines, disproved by the large number of their members, in all countries, who, for their love of truth and opposition to heresy, have received the crown of martyrdom. See on this point *P. Gaudentius*, **Contributions to the Church History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.**

Digitized by Google

all doubt that her episcopal sees were occupied by men who by their lives and teachings gave a brilliant example to the flocks under their charge; nay, among the inferior clergy there were a considerable number of educated men of pure morals.[1]

While men and women,[2] gifted alike with intelligence and divine inspiration, raised their voices in warning, in admonition, and in prayer for the regeneration of the clergy and the people, the heretics, especially the Fratricelli (§ 124), took advantage of the disorders of the time to attack the Church itself, and by their false prophecies still further to add to the disturbances.

It may be proper in this place to mention some of those men who are frequently alluded to, and even designated, as forerunners of the so-called Reformation of the sixteenth century.

It is with the greatest injustice, and in utter contradiction to historical fact, that the learned and pure-minded Dominican Savonarola, in San Marco, at Florence, is so designated; for this great enthusiast for religion and morality remained faithful alike to the Catholic Church and to his vows even to his last moment. He died in intimate communion with the Church, and in sincere obedience to her Supreme Head, expiating by a penitential death the faults which he had committed in the last years of his life under the excitement of a zeal arising from an over-ardent temperament.

The teaching of John Wessel (born 1419, died in a convent 1489), who was styled "Lux mundi — Magistrum contradictionum," has no relation whatever to the errors of Luther.

John of Goch, prior of the Augustinian Monastery at Mechlin (+ 1475), and John of Wesel taught manifest errors, similar to those of Luther. The latter (+ 1482) submitted to the decision of the ecclesiastical authority.

The beneficial influence exercised by the Church on political life is seen from the fact that she united nations heretofore divided into many parties hostile to one another, and from chaotic disorder formed well-constituted States, which became a central point of union and stability in the restoration of the Western Empire.

Although in the course of time conflicts arose between the temporal and spiritual powers, struggles between the imperial and

[1] Even James Wimpheling, the severe censor of the clergy, confesses that he knows numerous ecclesiastics distinguished for learning and science, and enjoying a reputation of irreproachable morals. The writers of the Middle Ages enumerated by *Trithem.* De script. eccl. testify that science was not neglected by the clergy.

[2] See § 142, and above.

Digitized by Google

sacerdotal rights, the independence of each was maintained. It was reserved for the so-called Reformation of the sixteenth century to bestow on temporal princes the dignity of Pontifex Maximus.

Even as the Church reorganized the State, so also did she infuse her regenerative spirit into legislation, and inspire those glorious laws of the Middle Ages which, equally averse to a false freedom as to a despotic absolutism, place obedience to God at the head of all laws, while they urge that the commandment to obey those who are kings and princes by the grace of God, — that is, the duly appointed authorities, — is equally inherent in these same laws.

§ 156. *Retrospect concerning the Influence exercised by the Church in the Middle Ages.*

In order to recognize the influence of the Church during the Middle Ages, we need but compare, in an impartial spirit, the intellectual and moral condition of the nations at the opening and at the close of the period under discussion.

When the Church directed her attention to the Germanic and Slavic tribes with the view of converting them, she had to encounter on the one hand the darkness of paganism, on the other the deceptive heresies to which they had given themselves, both of which finally yielded to the light of faith.

Together with the supernatural mysteries of faith, the Church brought to these same nations, which stood at a very low stage of civilization, the treasures of natural science. She founded those excellent institutions which afterwards became universities, — universities which cherished a knowledge proceeding from the profoundest, most fervent depths of objective Christianity, and which are alike a marvellous product of Christian genius and a memorable monument of intellectual power: they may best be compared with the art and genius which at the same period called into being the grand minsters and cathedrals of the Christian world.

But it was not theology and philosophy alone which engaged their attention; other branches of human knowledge, such as historical writing, poetry, and the like, developed themselves, under the protection of the Church, to an admirable degree of perfection. The studies of the Humanists were also promoted, — nay, in many respects may be said to have been rendered possible, — because in the same measure in which the Church hates a false and godless explanation

Digitized by Google

of phenomena, does she foster and encourage in her children the pursuit of true science.

What the Church has done for art is best illustrated by pointing to the glorious monuments of mediæval erection, in which the inventive genius of mankind, illumined by the interior light of faith, has achieved an everlasting triumph.

The ennobling spirit of the Church in the Middle Ages was also effective in its operation on the hearts of men. It transformed them from savage hordes to civilized and virtuous men. The Church could not, it is true, eradicate every disorder from domestic and political life; and many times evils proceeding from such disorder spread and increased, as is clearly proved by the complaints and enactments of synods and enlightened bishops. But these disorders do not rob the Church of the merit of having raised the nations intrusted to her from a state of barbarism to one of a higher civilization and culture.

In this way the Church had amply acquitted herself of her mission in the Middle Ages, and needed not reformation by the hand of man in the sixteenth century; rather was it man that was ever in need of spiritual and moral regeneration through the Church. "Homines per sacra immutari fas est, non sacra per homines" ("Men must be changed by that which is holy, not that which is holy be changed by men"), — words of Ægidius of Viterbo, General of the Augustinians, spoken at the opening of the Fifth Lateran Council.

Digitized by Google

Third Epoch.

PERIOD I.

FROM THE SO-CALLED REFORMATION TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

A. EXTERIOR HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 157. *Missions in India, Cochin China, Tonquin, Siam, Thibet, etc.*

AT the very time that apostate priests and monks and avaricious rulers were intent on robbing the Catholic nations of the West, by force or by cunning, of the faith of their fathers, numerous missionaries were traversing the immeasurable regions of Asia and Africa and the primeval forests of America to convert the idolatrous inhabitants to the faith of Christ.[1] Besides the newly founded orders of the Jesuits and the Capuchins, the old orders took a noble part in the missionary work, which was under the supreme direction of the Congregation of the Propaganda, founded by Pope Gregory XV. in the year 1622.[2]

The apostle of Hindostan is St. Francis Xavier, S. J.,[3]—one of the founders of the Society of Jesus. In the year 1542 he landed at Goa; and after converting the Portuguese colonists, who were Chris-

[1] *Fabricii*, Lux salutaris Evangelii, p. 662 sqq. *Mamachi*, Orig. et antiquit. Christ. lib. ii. p. 2. *Henrion*, Hist. des Missions. *Marshall*, The Christian Missions.

[2] Congregatio de propaganda fide. Pope Urban VIII. established a seminary (Collegium Urbanum) for the education of missionaries from all countries. The Propaganda possesses a large printing-office, which prints books in all languages for the missions. (Feast of Languages on the Sunday after the Epiphany.) In Paris, in 1663, the seminary for foreign missions was founded. Besides these large institutions, there were eighty other smaller seminaries for missions.

[3] *Tursellini*, Vita scti Franc. Xav. lib. vi. Rom. 1594. Epist. lat. Rom. 1596. On the missions in India, see *Maffei*, Hist. Ind. Flor. 1588.

Digitized by Google

tians in name only, he went among the Paravians on the fishing-coast, where he opened his mission, which he subsequently extended to the shores of Travancor and the island of Ceylon. He also established churches in Malacca and on the Moluccas (isles), everywhere converting numerous heathens and Mahometans. His success may be ascribed not only to the peculiar qualifications and self-sacrificing zeal of the great missionary, but still more to the undoubted gift of miracles with which God assisted him in his work. Leaving the further prosecution of his work in India to be continued by members of his order, St. Francis set out on the toilsome journey to Japan.

The exertions of the missionaries among the Hindoos were too often frustrated by the sharp line drawn between the castes, as well as by other causes; for instance, the communication which took place between the Jesuits and the Pariahs prevented intercourse between the former and the caste of Brahmins.

In order to remove this impediment, the Jesuit Robert Nobili, in 1606, with the approbation of the Archbishop of Cranganore, in Mandura, took upon himself the character of a Sanias, or penitential Brahmin, followed to the letter their severe mode of life, and avoided all intercourse with the Pariahs. In this way he soon won the confidence and good-will of the Brahmins, and led many into the Church. Other missionaries followed the example of Nobili; and the missionary work was progressing successfully, when it came to a halt in the matter of "Malabar usages or customs."

The missionaries of other orders did not approve of the accommodating methods in use practised by the Jesuits, and combated the peculiar usages of the Hindoos, which the Jesuit missionaries looked upon as unimportant, and tolerated for the sake of attaining a greater advantage. The conflict soon assumed an importance that rendered it necessary to have recourse to the Apostolic See for decision. To restore peace, Clement XI. sent the titular patriarch of Antioch, afterwards Cardinal Tournon, to India. He arrived at Pondichery in 1703, heard the Jesuits and their opponents, and rejected the Malabar customs. The Pope confirmed this decision, adding, however, the proviso "until the Holy See shall decide otherwise." His successor, Clement XII. (1739), and Benedict XIV. (1744), renewed the prohibition, and laid on the missionaries the obligation of obedience. Meantime the representations of the Jesuits effected some modification in the decree of Tournon as regards some particular points.

Digitized by Google

Besides these controversies, the decline of the Portuguese authority in the East Indies proved specially prejudicial to the Catholic missionaries, since the new rulers of the country, the English, hindered them altogether in the fulfilment of their vocation, or laid serious obstacles in the way, which made it difficult for them to proceed.

In India, beyond the Ganges, Christianity made great conquests. St. Francis Xavier had already preached the gospel on the peninsula of Malay.

The Jesuits had labored in Cochin China from the year 1618, and since 1627 in Tonquin also; they founded Christian communities, which remained there in part, despite the violent persecutions which took place, particularly in the years 1694, 1721, and 1734.

In Siam the Christian religion made fine progress; it was still more successful in the Philippine Islands, which were under the dominion of Spain. As early as 1597 the episcopal see of Manilla, established in 1579, was formed into an archiepiscopal see, and three other bishoprics were subordinated to it.

The efforts of the Jesuits (1624) to preach the gospel in Thibet were unsuccessful. The Capuchins, under their superior, Father Horace della Penna, were more fortunate; for the Dalai Lama permitted them in 1707 to preach the gospel in his empire. In 1637 and 1742 persecutions broke out which retarded the progress of the missions.

§ 158. *Christianity in China and Japan, and in Africa.*

Since the fifteenth century the Chinese Empire had been shut to the gospel messengers, and it was the efforts of the Jesuits that first succeeded in sowing the seed of Christianity in the Celestial Empire. St. Francis Xavier had already conceived the plan of preaching the gospel in China, but was compelled to leave the execution of this idea to other members of his order, who in 1582 began their labors in this country.

At the head of the three missionaries who came to China at this time was Matteo Ricci, from Macerata. At first he labored at Canton and Nanking, where he learned the language and the customs of the natives; and in the year 1600 he went to Pekin, where his extensive knowledge gained him the favor of the emperor, who permitted him to establish missionary stations in the capital and in the provinces (+ 1610).

Digitized by Google

Still more successful was Father John Adam Schall of Cologne (after 1622), whom the Emperor Xuntschin first elevated to the rank of a Mandarin and President of the Mathematical Society of Pekin.

After the death of Xuntschin a revolution broke out, which cost many Christians their lives. Among the victims was Father Schall (+ 1666). The insurgents were not, however, able to suppress Christianity; and when peace was once more restored, the missionaries resumed their laborious undertaking. The new emperor, Khanghi, was a great patron of the Christians. He appointed the Jesuit Ferdinand Verbiest of Bruges (+ 1688) President of the Mathematical Society, and in 1692 permitted the Chinese to adopt Christianity at their own free-will.

The controversies respecting the so-called "Chinese usages" proved a great disadvantage to the missions. This dispute first arose from the veneration paid by the Chinese to their ancestors and to Confucius. The Jesuits considered these customs, which had existed from primeval times and were sanctioned by the civil law, as purely civic transactions, and tolerated them under certain restrictions among their new converts. The Dominicans, on the other hand, who had labored in China since the year 1633, declared these customs idolatrous, and forbade the Christians to observe them.

To put an end to the conflict, the Congregation of the Propaganda, at the instigation of the Dominican Morales in 1645, with the consent of Pope Innocent X., prohibited the "Chinese usages" until the Apostolic See should decide otherwise. This decree was, however, modified, on the representations of the Jesuit Martini, and in its modified form was approved by Alexander VII. in 1656.

Tranquillity was not, however, entirely restored, and after a while the miserable dissension was again renewed. The matter in dispute had reference chiefly to the use of the two words, Tien and Khangti (heaven), which are used by the Chinese to signify God.

The condemnation of the "Chinese usages," which had been pronounced by the Apostolic Vicar, Charles Maigrot (1693), was repeated by the papal legate Tournon (1702); and Pope Clement XI. confirmed the prohibition in the bull "Ex illa die" (1715), and Benedict XIV. reaffirmed it under severe penalties in 1742 by his bull "Ex quo singulari" (1742). The Jesuits immediately submitted to the papal decision.

Digitized by Google

The death of the Emperor Khanghi (+ 1722) was a great loss to the Christians; for under his son Yong-tsching (+ 1735) a great persecution of the Church broke out, which continued under Emperor Kien-long (+ 1799), and many fell victims to it.

St. Francis Xavier had introduced the gospel into Japan as early as 1549. Members of his order continued the work begun by him, and the Christian religion triumphed gloriously over idolatry. Men and women of the highest classes, even some princes, entered the Church, and drew after them many of the lower classes. In the year 1585 a noble embassy of Christian Japanese went to Rome to Pope Gregory XIII.

But as early as 1587 a cruel and protracted persecution broke out against the Church in Japan. The first enemy of the Christians was the Emperor Taikosama, who commanded the missionaries to leave the country, had many churches pulled down, and finally inflicted the penalty of death, under its most terrible forms of torture, on the Christians. Edicts of blood still more severe followed in the years 1614 and 1615, in which, besides the Bonzes (Buddhist priests), the Dutch traders took no small part. Skinning the limbs, burying the victim in a ditch, the water-rack, burning alive, and crucifying were the most common punishments; but all these kinds of martyrdom did not bring the Christians to apostasy. The missionaries and the faithful died in the spirit of heroism.

More terrible yet was the persecution that took place under the Emperor Toxogun-sama in the year 1637. This was fomented by the calumnies of the Dutch, who accused the Japanese Christians of being in a conspiracy with the Portuguese against the life of the emperor. The emperor, deceived by fictitious letters that were laid before him, became furious with rage, and proceeded with fire and sword against the Christians. He also forbade to all foreigners except the Dutch entrance into the Japanese ports; and in order to discover which of those who entered were Christians, the use of Jesumi was introduced, — that is, the Japanese and the foreigners who arrived in the seaports were ordered to trample the crucifix under foot. Then the Christian religion was almost thoroughly eradicated from Japan. It is only in our own times that Christianity has been renewed in this land, which is saturated with the blood of so many martyrs.

In the eighteenth century a terrible persecution broke out on the peninsula of Corea also, which threatened to extirpate the infant Church. But in spite of all persecution, the Christians, who were

Digitized by Google

deprived of their priests, remained faithful to the Catholic religion, for which even to the present time they sacrifice their property and their lives.[1]

In Africa the spread of the Christian Church was chiefly limited to the Portuguese settlements in Mozambique, Monomotapa, Sofala, and Quiloa, with those of the French on the Isle de France and Isle de Bourbon on the eastern coast. On the western coast there are Christian communities in the kingdoms partially dependent on Portugal, — Congo, Angola, Benguela, Cacongo, and Loango; on the Cape Verd Islands, the Canaries, Madeira, etc. The missionaries belonged almost exclusively to the Order of Capuchins. Their laborious work was rendered considerably more difficult by the unhealthy climate and the savage manners of the natives.

The attempts to bring back the Monophysites of Abyssinia into the Church were as yet unsuccessful.

The reports of the ex-Capuchin Norbert (Peter Parisot of Barleduc) concerning the labors of the Jesuits in Japan lose all their value when one considers the life of this immoral man, who went so far as to renounce his faith and break his vows; who conducted a saloon for a time, joined the French philosophers, and finally entered the service of Pombal, who was the despot of Portugal, and the bitter enemy of the Church and of the Jesuits.

The Jesuits, whose views were grounded on an experience of many years, considered, as did also missionaries of other orders, that the controverted usages or customs were merely civic ceremonies, which they therefore tolerated in so far as they were not mixed up with superstitious practices, because they saw that it was expedient to their missionary work. Nevertheless, they never refused obedience to the Apostolic See, the decision of which took into consideration the underlying principle, and was given in regard to the general welfare of the whole Church rather than in reference to the success of a single mission, — awaiting the conversion of the heathen chiefly from divine grace.

The enemies of the Jesuits, especially the Jansenists, availed themselves of every occasion that presented itself to attack the Order of the Jesuits.

On the respective literature see *Mamachi*, Orig. et antiq. ii. 407. The most important writings are *Daniel* (S. J.), Hist. apologétique de la conduite des Jésuites de la Chine: Recueil des divers ouvrages, t. iii. Paris, 1724, and *Pray*. Hist. controversiarum de ritibus Sinicis. Pestini, 1789.

[1] In the year 1800 there were ten thousand Christians in Corea; and in 1857 this number had, in spite of persecution, increased to fifteen thousand.

Digitized by Google

§ 159. *Christian Missions in America.*

A. Discovery of America.

Missions in the Isles and in Countries South of the present United States.

The discovery of America[1] opened a new field of action to the apostolic missionaries of the religious orders. The Genoese *Christopher Columbus* (Colon), born in 1436, discovered, on Oct. 12, 1492, the small island of Guanahani (called by him San Salvador); then, after going to Cuba, he also discovered Hayti, where he built a fort; and on the 3d of May, 1493, went back to Spain. On the third voyage, undertaken on May 30, 1498, he discovered the American Continent. The great admiral considered it lawful to reduce to slavery the savage natives, at least some of them, because he believed it would be impossible for them to be converted if they remained free in their wild, rude state. Queen Isabella, however, forbade the further selling of Indians, and ordered those who had been already brought to Spain to be sent back. Columbus, who used the so-called rights of conquest on a very broad scale, was inclined in other respects to acknowledge the natural rights of the natives, but could not hinder his own rebellious followers from inflicting hardships on the Indians in Xaragua, where they compelled them to work as slaves. He was obliged to compromise matters by permitting them to retain the Indians as servants for the cultivation of their lands, on condition of their ruling and protecting them, as also that their chiefs should select and send the Indians whom they were thus to hold. This was the beginning of the system called "Repartimiento;" that is, of that distribution, or parcelling out, of the Indians which proved so great an obstacle in converting them to Christianity. Columbus, who, in spite of his great achievements, met with ungrateful treatment, died at Valladolid, May 20, 1506, soon after returning from his fourth voyage. Even the land he discovered did not receive its name from him; it was called America from the Florentine *Amerigo Vespucci*, who made his first voyage in 1499. The further discoveries of the Spaniards were made from Hispaniola (Little Spain) or St. Domingo, as a central point.

The disputes between the Spaniards and the Portuguese respecting the claims to the newly discovered islands were settled successfully by Pope *Alexander VI.*, who drew a line of demarcation from the North to the South Pole, and made other regulations (1493). The intention of the Pontiff, apart from that of adjusting the contests between the two kingdoms, was to secure the in-

[1] Coleccion de Bulas, breves y otros documentos relativa á la iglesia de América, etc. por el *P. Fr. Javier Hernaez, S. J.* 2 vols. Brussels, 1879. Interesting notices are contained in Noticias secretas de America, por *Don Jorge Juan y Don Ant.* Ulloa (composed in 1743 by order of Ferdinand VI.) sacadas á luz por *Don David Barry.* Lond. 1826. See, also, *Eyzaguirre*, Los intereses catolicos de América. 2 vols. Paris, 1859. *Robertson*, Hist. of America. London, 1772.

Digitized by Google

troduction of Christianity among the Indians. The first missionaries ot America were Benedictines, Hieronymites, Franciscans, and Dominicans. A great obstacle to the conversion of the natives, apart from their savage and untamed manners, was found in the avarice and cruelty of the Spaniards; though we admit that the charges against the Spaniards have been somewhat exaggerated. The missionaries stoutly contended for the freedom of the Indians. The Benedictine *Buil*, the apostolic vicar sent there by the Pope, made a strong appeal in their favor. In the year 1502 twelve Franciscans arrived with the Knight Nicholas Ovando. As King Ferdinand was not satisfied with the papal bulls of Julius II. for the erection ot new bishoprics, they were not carried into execution. It was between 1311 and 1313 that in St. Domingo the sees of St. Domingo and of La Concepcion de la Vega were first established, as also one in the island Puertorico, bearing the same name as that of the island.

As early as 1508 the Spanish kings were invested with the right of patronage over the sees then in contemplation. Since 1510 the Dominicans had been settled in Hispaniola. They denounced the distribution of Indians as slaves to the conqueror, as being equally a violation of their natural right, of Christian law, and of sound policy.

At an early period negro slaves were brought from Africa to replace the Indian slaves; they were considered stronger and more able to work, and were particularly employed in the mines and sugar plantations. The Government allowed the introduction of only such negroes as were born under Christian masters. Although the importation of the black race was limited by law, those limits were not heeded; the importation continued despite the law. The celebrated Cardinal *Ximenes*, regent of Spain after the death of Ferdinand, strictly forbade it in 1516. The young king Charles, to whom application was made, granted, however, several concessions, notwithstanding the warning of Ximenes. Even the Hieronymites and *Bartholomew de las Casas*, who is so highly renowned for his vindication of the rights of the Indians, wished, under some restrictions, to have the negroes, who were slaves already, employed in the labors of the colonies, instead of the weaker Indians, who, against their natural rights, were thus deprived of their freedom. In this way, subject to many restrictions, negro slavery was introduced. After this no Indians except those of the tribe of the Caribs, who were cannibals, were allowed to be enslaved according to the royal decree.

Bartholomew de las Casas, born at Seville in 1474, came to Hispaniola with Columbus as early as 1502. He has been unjustly accused of inaugurating the slave-trade,[1] whereas he was a true apostle of the Indians; and in the cause of preserving their personal liberty he crossed the ocean sixteen times, and defended their rights with the zeal of an ardent love, in word, in writing, and in deed.

As the secular officers were not free from selfish interests, King Charles

[1] *Barth. de las Casas*, Brevissima relacion de la destruccion de las Indias. *Fabie*, Vida y escritos de D. Fr. Barth. de las Casas. 2 vols. Madrid, 1880.

Digitized by Google

thought it advisable to engage the services of the members of religious orders. When the Council of the Indies was reorganized in 1524, four of the eight seats and votes were given to ecclesiastics; and under this clerical influence many beneficent regulations were passed in behalf of the Indians.

Yet the contest continued; the friends of slavery maintaining that the Indians were but unreasoning beasts, and therefore born to slavery. On information received from *Julian Garces*, Bishop of Tlascala, of the Order of Friars Preachers, Pope *Paul III.* issued in 1537 bulls vindicating the liberty of the Indians and their dignity as human beings. The decree of Paul III. was ratified by succeeding Popes, and frequently renewed. Their example was imitated by the Spanish kings.

Meanwhile discoveries went on. *Ferdinand Cortez* came to Mexico[1] in 1519. *Francis Pizarro* discovered Peru in 1526–1527. Almagro reached Chili at about the same time. Moreover, while the inhabitants of the north of America proved to be for the most part wild tribes addicted to fetichism, the inhabitants of Mexico, Peru, and Chili exhibited a far higher culture; they had fine buildings, and a kind of picture-writing in which they kept their records, and were expert in several arts.

Twelve[2] Franciscans came to Mexico, who, undeterred by hardship and the fruitlessness of their first efforts, continued their laborious work, and under Father *Martin of Valencia* reaped rich fruits. In 1526 Dominicans also came, and in 1533 Augustinians also. In 1531 there were one hundred Franciscans and Dominicans in Mexico. The Franciscan *John de Zumarraga* (1528), Bishop-elect of Mexico, and *Sebastian Ramirez de Fuenleal,* Bishop of St. Domingo, forcibly advocated humane treatment of the natives and the total abolition of slavery.

Las Casas, a Dominican after 1522, and Bishop of Chiapa after 1544, remained unceasingly devoted to his noble cause until his death at Madrid in 1556. Mexico became a metropolitan city in 1546; St. Domingo, in 1547; Lima, in 1546; Santa Fé de Bogota, in 1564; and La Plata in Bolivia, in 1605. In Central America the bishoprics Nicaragua (1531) and Guatemala (1534) were erected; the first bishop of the latter diocese was the zealous Father *Marroquin* (+ 1563), who invited the Franciscans to come there.

In Peru[3] distinguished heralds of the faith were the bishops *Hernando de Lugne* (1529), *Reginald de Pedrazo,* and *Vincent Valverde* of Cuzco, the missionary *Thomas of St. Martin,* the zealous archbishop *Tubirius* of Lima (+ 1606), who in 1582 held a provincial synod with six bishops, *Pedro de la Gasca,* and *St. Francis Solanus,* the Apostle of Peru (+ 1610).

The second archbishop of Mexico, *Alonso de Montufar,* held two provincial councils. The bishops and missionaries proved themselves zealous apostles of peace and true friends of the persecuted natives.

[1] *Prescott,* History of the Conquest of Mexico. 3 vols. London and New York, 1843.

[2] This was the usual number sent.

[3] Apuntes para la hist. ecl. del Peru. Lima, 1873.

Digitized by Google

Although the salutary regulations they enacted could not be, or were not, enforced to their full extent or in every district, it remains a fact that it is chiefly owing to the influence exercised by the members of the religious orders, and by other of the clergy, that the Indians preserved their personal freedom, and that they were not altogether extirpated in the colonies. *St. Rose of Lima* is a beautiful evidence of Christian faith in Peru. In Venezuela the bishopric of Caraccas was established in 1530; in Chili,[1] the archbishopric of Santiago, in 1561.

In the year 1549 the first six Jesuits came, under Father *Emmanuel de Nobriga*, to St. Vincent in Brazil, where several Franciscans had previously labored and died as martyrs. Having rapidly acquired a knowledge of the language of the country, they, after inexpressible trouble, prevailed on a goodly number of the drunken, sensual cannibals who formed the population to abandon their vicious habits and to embrace Christianity. In 1551 an episcopal see was erected at Bahia, or San Salvador. The Government at Lisbon repeatedly made decrees in favor of Indian freedom, for which object the Jesuits zealously labored. Among these were distinguished the Ven. *Joseph Anchieta* (+ 1597), *Lorenzana*, *Montoya*, *Diaz Taño*. At the instance of the latter, Urban VIII.,[2] on April 22, 1639, by his admonitions enforced the observance of the bulls issued by Paul III. Father Azevedo (+ 1570), and more prominently *Anthony Vieyra* (+ 1677), the Lusitanian Cicero, superior of the mission of Maranhao in 1652, labored successfully in behalf of the faith, the civilization, and the freedom of the natives. In the year 1755 the King *Joseph I.* declared Indian slavery unconditionally abolished. The bishops, Jesuits, Capuchins, and other orders exerted themselves to carry out the decree; but it was precisely at that time that the Portuguese minister *Pombal*[3] dealt a murderous blow to the progress of Christianity and the freedom of the Indians. Since that time this once flourishing country commenced to decline, and has continued so to do up to the present day. In 1676 Brazil had had three dioceses, — Bahia, the metropolis, Pernambuco (Olinda), and Rio de Janeiro, — of which the last was in 1746 divided into five, to which in 1667 St. Louis was added. The fifth archbishop, *Sebastian Monteiro da Vide* (+ 1722), governed the diocese in a very able manner.

Together with other religious orders, the Jesuits labored in Peru, Chili, and Mexico. Fifty-six of them came to Peru in 1614. They established great institutions of learning, — as that of the Seminary of St. Ildephonsus, in Mexico; and among the apostles to the negroes, two of them, *Alonso Sandoval* (after 1605) and Saint *Peter Claver* (after 1615), hold distinguished places. In

[1] *Eyzguirre*, Hist. eccl. politique et littéraire de Chili, traduite par Poillon. 3 vols. Lille, 1855.

[2] Bulas, ii. 1013 sqq. Papal bulls, royal ordinances, etc., regarding Brazil, are contained in *C. Mendes de Almeida*, Direito civil ecclesiastico Brazileiro. 3 vols. Rio de Janeiro, 1866.

[3] *P. Weld*, The Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions. London, 1877.

Digitized by Google

New Granada, *St. Louis Bertrand* converted many thousand Indians, although serious obstacles were placed in his way by the cruelty of Europeans.

Guatemala was made a metropolis in 1742. The College of Ocopa in Peru, founded by the Franciscan Father *Francis de José* in 1724, was extolled by Clement XIII., and with that of the Jesuits in Cordova, won special fame. Colleges de Propaganda Fide for missionaries were established at Queretero and Zacatecas, which sent missionaries to the remotest frontiers of Mexico. The holding of provincial councils, as those convoked in Santa Fé de Bogota, Lima, and Mexico (1770–1774), were of great benefit to ecclesiastical organization.

By far the most important mission of the Jesuits was that of Paraguay.[1] This country, lying along the banks of the river La Plata, was discovered by the Spaniards in 1516, and formal possession was taken in 1536. The Franciscans were the first to preach the Gospel here. The Jesuits, who went there at the invitation of Bishop Francis Victoria of Tucuman, of the Order of Preachers, conceived the idea, like that of the ancient missionaries among the Germans, of combining the conversion of these rude tribes with a gradually progressing cultivation of the soil, and of organizing by degrees a regularly constituted State from the various Christian communities. Fathers *J. Cataldino* and *C. Maceta* set the work on foot. Philip III., King of Spain, approved of the plan of organizing a Christian republic in Paraguay in order to facilitate the work of conversion. Under the supervision and guidance of the Jesuits several settlements arose, which were named Reductions; and no Spaniard was allowed to enter any one of these settlements without permission from the fathers of the order. The inhabitants, who paid tribute to the Spanish crown, were gradually trained to habits of industry, to domestic life, to civilization, and to Christian virtue; they also became able to repel the attacks of hostile neighboring tribes. The number of the reductions was augmented to thirty. The population increased marvellously. The inhabitants of Paraguay became good men and good Christians. A misunderstanding between the Jesuits and the bishops *Cardenas* (1640) and *John Palafox* of Angelopolis (1647) was very injurious to the prosperity of the new State. The treaty between Spain and Portugal which was concluded in 1750 greatly injured Paraguay; but the severest misfortune that befell the reductions was the suppression of the Society of Jesus.

The neighboring province of Chiquitos, as also Maranhao, on the Amazon, were equally flourishing when under the care of the Jesuits. Father *Cyprian Baraza* preached to the Moxos. Father *Decré* converted the Yameos and other tribes; he translated the Christian doctrine into eighteen different Indian idioms, and made catechists of the most capable of his neophytes. In Quito (Ecuador) the Jesuits labored in the Maynas missions. In New Granada

[1] *Muratori*, Il Christianesimo felice, nelle missioni del Paraguai. Venet. 1743. *Charlevoix*, Hist. de Paraguay. Paris, 1759. Cf. *Mamachi*, Orig. et antiquit. ii. 326 sqq.

Digitized by Google

(Columbia), where in 1723 many tribes were yet unconverted, German Jesuits founded the Llanos missions.

The American soil has frequently been watered by the blood of martyrs. Father *Samuel Fritz* (1680–1728), *Henry Richter* (1684–1699), *Mascardi*, *Giu Celmo*, and many others, died the death of martyrs.

In Guiana, where in 1560 two Dominicans, and in 1643 several French Capuchins, were martyred, the Jesuits labored successfully after 1664.

B. Missions in the United States and Canada.[1]

Spanish Missions in Florida, New Mexico, Texas, California.

The first missionaries who came to the territory now known as the United States were brought over in the expedition of Ponce de Leon in 1521. Several Franciscans accompanied Pamphilus de Narvaez, and came to Florida in 1528 under the guidance of Father John Juarez. After months of fruitless toil and severe suffering, the missionaries perished near the mouth of the Mississippi. This expedition, however, though not crowned with success, paved the way to renewed efforts in the future.

In 1547 the Dominican Father Louis Cancer de Barbastro, a native of Saragossa, who had already been successful among the Indian tribes of Vera Paz, applied personally to King Philip for approval of his scheme, and having obtained it, he set out on a mission to Florida with three companions. He and Father Diego fell victims to the cruelty of the savages. The Dominicans renewed their efforts in 1553 and 1554. The expedition of Pedro Menendez (Melandez) de Aviles, an old Spanish admiral, resulted in the foundation of St. Augustine (1565), which is the oldest town in the United States. At the solicitation of Menendez, *St. Francis Borgia*, then general of the Jesuits, in 1566 sent some members of his order to the new field.

Somewhat later, John B. Segura, who was appointed vice-provincial of the order in Florida, was sent there, with several others, to take part in the missionary work. Pope Pius V. encouraged the undertaking by a letter to Menendez, who at that time had become the governor of Florida. The Jesuits were disheartened by the continued resistance made to their preaching by the Indians, among whom polygamy seems to have been universally practised. Father Segura and his brave companions then proposed to themselves to make a missionary journey to the banks of the Chesapeake or St. Mary's Bay (Virginia and Maryland), but were basely murdered on the way, through the treachery of Don Luis, a converted brother of an Indian chieftain who had even

[1] History of Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States, by *J. Gilmary Shea*, who also gives the literature. History of the Catholic Church in the United States, by *J. O'Kane Murray;* also, by the same, Catholic Heroes and Heroines of America: Pioneers of America. *Bancroft*, History of the United States.

Digitized by Google

accompanied the Dominican Fathers to Spain. Father Rogel withdrew, with the other missionaries of his order, to Havana and then to Mexico.

The missionary work in Florida was then confided to the Franciscans, who labored there in peace for two years. Among them the eminent *Peter de Corpa* was martyred, at the place which is now the cemetery of St. Augustine, by a convert whom he had reproved for his vicious excesses. This murder was the signal for a series of cruel attacks upon the missionaries, many of whom then received the crown of martyrdom. The missions were then for a time almost abandoned, until in 1602 they were renewed with fresh vigor. A Franciscan province under the name of St. Helena — so called from its principal convent, St. Helena, at St. Augustine — was established. Bands of Franciscans came successively thither. Soon about twenty residences were established, and the missions steadily extended among the Apalaches and the Creeks in West Florida and Georgia. In time a church and chapels were built at Pensacola.

The subsequent encroachments of English colonists greatly injured the progress of the missions, many of which were entirely broken up. Missionaries were slaughtered and Indian converts sold as slaves to the English West Indies. In 1763 Spain ceded Florida to England by the Treaty of Paris. "This," says Mr. Shea, "was the death-blow of the missions; by degrees all traces of former civilization disappeared; the celebrated convent of St. Helena became a barrack." How different had been the government of Catholic Spain from that of Protestant England!

After the Franciscan Father *Mark of Nice* had penetrated to New Mexico in 1540, an exploring expedition was set on foot in 1542, under the leadership of Coronado. When the leader, disappointed in not seeing his anticipations realized, proposed to return, the two Franciscans, Father *John de Padilla* and the lay brother *John of the Cross*, remained. Both labored valiantly in the territory until they received the martyr's crown. The unfavorable accounts given by Coronado prevented further missionary attempts until nearly forty years later. when in 1581 they were resumed by three brave Franciscans, — Fathers *Francis Lopez* and *John de Santo Maria*, with Brother Alphonsus Rodriguez, — who met a like heroic fate. In the following year *Espego*, a Spanish nobleman, who founded the city of Santa Fé, the second oldest city in the United States, ascertained their fate on an expedition which he made at his own expense. After the conquest and settlement of New Mexico by John de Oñate, the missions were renewed. Under Father *Francis de Escobar*, the successor to the commissary Escalona (1602), and under his successor *Alonzo Panaido*, a rapid change took place; whole tribes of the dusky savages were brought into the Church. "So rapid had been the progress of Christianity and civilization on the Rio Grande that the Indians (or Pueblos) could read and write before the Puritans were established on the shores of New England."[1] Several Spanish settlements grew up; and these, like the missions, were attended by the Franciscans.

[1] See *Shea*, p. 81.

Digitized by Google

In 1544 a Spanish Franciscan Father, *Andrew de Olmos*, who was afterwards joined by *John de Mesa*, a secular priest, visited the Texan tribes near the Rio Grande, many of whom he converted. In 1688 fourteen Franciscan priests and seven lay brothers came to Texas and laid the foundation of missions which, with some slight intermissions, were conducted by members of the same order for over one hundred years, when in 1812 they were suppressed by the Spanish Government.

In California the first Mass was said by a Franciscan in 1601; the real apostle of this State was, however, Father *Juniper Serra*,[1] a Franciscan, who had exercised his ministry in different parts of Mexico. He, accompanying the expedition of Galvez in 1769, led several priests of his order to this new field of labor; success crowned their efforts. The mission of San Diego was founded July 16, 1764; that of San Carlos, at Monterey, in 1770; that of St. Anthony of Padua, 1771; and others followed. The mission of San Francisco was established June 27, 1776. Numerous conversions took place. Father Serra, Prefect Apostolic, was in 1774 authorized by the Holy See to administer the sacrament of confirmation. He ended his glorious life still filled with holy desires. Father *Palou*, his future biographer, and subsequently Father *Lazven*, succeeded him as prefect.

Although the territory does not form a part of the United States, it may be fitting to mention in this place the pioneers of faith and civilization in Lower (Old) California.[2] There were Franciscans after 1596; and the Jesuits *Salvatierra* and *Francis Kuehn* (Kino) came about 1679. The latter, who had been a professor of mathematics at Ingolstadt in Germany, was the first to preach to the tribes in Colorado. In 1697 Salvatierra founded the first permanent college in California at Loretto. In 1768 the Jesuits were removed by force, pursuant to an order of the Government. The Franciscans and Dominicans took up the work which the Jesuits were thus compelled to surrender, and continued it.

The English Missions.

We have already noted the ill fate of Father Segura and his eight companions in the territory which forms the present State of Virginia, in 1570. In 1624 Maryland was granted by King Charles I. of England to the Catholic convert *Lord Baltimore* (Sir George Calvert), who called it Maryland in honor of the queen-consort, the Catholic Princess Henrietta Maria. He drew up a charter for the colony, which granted freedom of worship to all Christians. His death occurred on the 12th of April, 1632, before the royal signature had been affixed to the charter. The territory was reached by the Catholic pilgrim fathers from England, under the Lord's second son, Leonard Calvert. They came to the mouth of the Chesapeake on March 3, 1634, and took formal

[1] *Francis Palou*, Life of Ven. Padre Juniper Serra; translated by V. Rev. J. Adams. See *The Century*, May, 1883.

[2] Father Hyacinth Cortes, S. J., came there as early as 1642. See *Shea*, p. 89.

Digitized by Google

possession of the land, on the feast of the Annunciation of the same month, on St. Clement's (now called Blackstone) Island.

The pioneers of religious freedom were accompanied by the Jesuit Fathers *Andrew White* and *John Altham*. New priests arriving from England and from Douay College, the mission gradually extended its limits. In 1639, after many conversions had taken place, there were five permanent stations here. On July 5, 1640, the most solemn baptism of Chilomacon, King of the Piscataways, who received the name of Charles, took place. Father Altham died soon after this. White, weakened by bodily exertion, devoted himself to composing a grammar, a dictionary, and a catechism in the language of his flock. Several other chieftains and whole villages embraced the faith. Even many Protestants returned to the faith of their fathers, as the Catholic priests were the only clergymen in the colony.

While the Jesuits were thus reaping the fruits of their divinely inspired labors, Clayborne, a man who in 1635 had already excited the natives against the missionaries, now headed a band of Puritan fanatics, who, having been expelled from Anglican Virginia in 1642, had found a refuge in Maryland. In 1644 they destroyed the mission; in the following year they expelled the Catholic governor, and sent the Jesuits as prisoners to England. This was done in the land which first raised the standard of freedom of conscience. Governor Calvert returned in 1646, and by degrees the Jesuits resumed the missions. Thus Maryland became a starting-point of Catholicity. In 1649 the General Assembly, composed of eleven Catholics and three Protestant voters, passed the famous Toleration Act. Only five years later, the ungrateful Puritans, after the execution of Charles I., denied that liberty to the Catholics which had been accorded to themselves.

King Charles II. having restored Lord Baltimore's proprietary rights in 1660, harmony reigned until James II. was dethroned in 1688. The Catholic proprietor was then deprived of his rights. In 1692 a Protestant governor was appointed for Maryland, and the Anglican Church established by law. Enactments tending to root out Catholicity entirely followed one another; most of these remained in force until the time of the Revolution. But although, in consequence of these, the Indian missions ceased to exist, the religion of the Catholic pilgrim fathers still held its own, although many, like the Baltimore family, fell away from the faith.

Pennsylvania was visited by priests soon after the settlement by Penn. In 1730 Rev. Father *Greaton*, S. J., was sent from Maryland to Philadelphia. Later on, Father Greaton was replaced by Fathers *Harding* and *Farmer*. The churches of St. Joseph and St. Mary were soon places of Catholic worship in the city of "brotherly love." The courageous Jesuit Father *Schneider* (+ 1764) labored devotedly among the Catholic Germans, and extended his labors to New Jersey, as Farmer did to New York.

Digitized by Google

The French Missions in Maine (Upper Canada), New York, Vermont, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, and Louisiana.

These missions were prompted by truly religious motives, — that is, by the desire to extend the kingdom of Christ. The first French mission in the north of the Union was established on Neutral Island in Scoodic River in 1609, eleven years before the Puritans came to Massachusetts. Two Jesuit Fathers, *Peter Biard* and *Enemond Massé*, were, at the request of Henry IV., sent thither by the provincial Father Coton. Through the generosity of the Marchioness de Guercheville a new mission was established in 1612 on Mount Desert Island, at the mouth of the Penobscot, in the present diocese of Portland, under the name of Holy Savior. But, alas! a foe soon came to destroy the promising mission. A band of Englishmen, under the infamous Argall, attacked the place, killed Du Thet, a lay brother, and carried off priests and colonists. Soon after, the Recollects and Capuchins established missions for the French and Indians on the coast, from Maine to Nova Scotia. In 1646 the Jesuits renewed their efforts among the Indians; they had in the mean time established a flourishing mission in Canada. Rev. Father *Druillettes*, S. J., established a new mission in Maine on the upper Kennebec. The love, gratitude, and attachment of the Abnaki to their spiritual fathers were extraordinary. The Catholic missionaries gradually succeeded in converting the whole tribe. But the English drove away the missionaries, destroyed the churches, and persecuted the Indians. Yet amid the hard trials they still adhered to the faith; and when, in 1695, the Jesuit *Sebastian Rale*, who was versed in the Indian idiom and renowned as a missionary, came among them, they joyfully hailed his arrival. This noble priest, after years of labor, was murdered by a troop of Englishmen and pagan Mohawks.

After France ceded Canada to England in 1763, the Abnaki mission was left without a priest until after the close of the Revolution, when Rev. Dr. *Carroll* gave them one in the person of Father *Ciquard*. The Abnaki bands known as the Penobscots and Passamaquoddis, have to this day persistently adhered to the faith which they had so eagerly embraced.

New York State was inhabited by five tribes of the Iroquois, — a people in many respects superior to the Algonquins, albeit modesty was at a somewhat low ebb among them. The Recollect Fathers *Le Caron*, *Nicholas Viel* and others had preached to the Hurons in Upper Canada, and the Jesuit Father *John de Brebeuf* had established a flourishing mission. From Quebec as a central point, whence the glorious beams of faith radiated through the sons of St. Ignatius, Father *Isaac Jogues*[1] was sent to found a mission among the Mohawks who dwelt on the river of that name. Father Jogues, who had formerly been a missionary among the Hurons in Canada, and had also been the first to plant the cross on the soil of Michigan, had already been taken prisoner and been tortured by the Mohawks in 1642. Having escaped by the aid of the Dutch, and gone from New Amsterdam (New York) back to France,

[1] *Shea's* Life of Fr. Isaac Jogues. The Pilgrim of Our Lady of Martyrs.

Digitized by Google

he returned to Canada, and thence set out again for the territory of New York. He and his companion *Lalande* were murdered, on Oct. 18, 1646, at the village of Caughnawaga, now Auriesville, where also *René Goupil*, novice, S. J., had shed his blood shortly before. Father *A. Daniel* was martyred by the Mohawks in 1648. The celebrated Father Brebeuf, together with his associate Lalemant, was captured and put to a horrible death by the Iroquois, March 16, 1649. Father *Le Moyne*, who may be regarded as successor to Father Jogues, was sent from Quebec, in July, 1653, to the Onondagas, who, like the Mohawks, wished to conclude a peace with Canada. After he had returned to Canada, Fathers *Chaumonot* and *Dablon* came and founded a permanent mission. They built St. Mary's Chapel near the site where now stands the city of Syracuse. After three years of successful labor, the missionaries, having discovered a plot against themselves and the French settlers set on foot by the medicine-men, withdrew to Canada. Father Le Moyne went again among them in 1661. He baptized two hundred children, after which he returned to Canada, where he died in 1666. After the Mohawks had been humbled by the French, all the missions were re-established. In 1668 the sign of the cross was planted in every village from the Hudson River to Lake Erie. The village of Caughnawaga, on the Mohawk, became the centre of the missions among the Iroquois, called also the Five Nations.

That the Indians might escape the evil example and persecution of their heathenish brethren, the missionaries subsequently established a Christian village on the banks of the St. Lawrence, at La Prairie, and later at the St. Louis Rapids, for the benefit of the converted Iroquois, many of whom were Mohawks; at the latter-named place, which was some miles above Montreal, a village was firmly established in 1676. This was the last mission among the Mohawks of New York. By the treaty of Utrecht, in 1713, France formally renounced all claim to the Iroquois territory. This was the prelude to the gradual dissolution of the missions among the Five Nations.

Among the missionaries who had labored in New York among the Indians after the death of Le Moyne, were the Jesuit Fathers Fremin, Bruyas, Menard, Millet, and De Lamberville. It was the last-named father who instructed the saintly Mohawk virgin *Catherine Tehgahkwita* (+ 1680), in Canada.

Father Jogues, as mentioned above, and his companion, Raymbault, were the first to preach Christianity on the Upper Lakes. They did not, however, remain long. The second mission attempted by the two Jesuits, Leonard Garreau and Gabriel Druillettes in 1656, at the solicitation of the Ottawas of the Algonquin race, was frustrated by an Iroquois war-party. *René Ménard*, an old Jesuit who had already been in New York State, after a dreadful voyage, came in 1660, and preached to the Indians on Lake Superior. While trying to reach a band of Hurons, he was lost in the wilderness, and perished either by the tomahawk or of starvation. Thus ended the first Ottawa mission. But, as Bancroft says, "the Jesuits never receded one foot." *Claudius Allouez* soon succeeded him. In 1665 he established the mission of the Holy Ghost at Lapointe, on Lake Superior, and preached to many tribes.

Digitized by Google

Father *James Marquette*,[1] of imperishable fame, left Quebec in 1668 to assist in the missions of the West. Father *Claudius Dablon* was appointed superior of the Upper missions, to which he was sent with Allouez, who had returned to Quebec for a short time. The mission of Sault Ste. Marie's was founded by Marquette. Father Allouez and Louis André, who was sent in 1670 with Father Druillettes, directed the missions at Green Bay, which Allouez had previously begun and had named St. Francis Xavier. When Marquette set out to explore the Mississippi in 1673, he was succeeded in the mission of St. Ignatius, which he had founded in 1671 at Mackinaw, by Father Pierson.

As the West was explored, French settlements arose at Detroit, Rivière au Raison, Sault Ste. Marie, Green Bay, Kaskaskia, Tamaroa, Cahokia, Prairie du Rocher, Vincennes, and Oniatenon, which were attended by Recollect and Jesuit fathers, and by secular priests from Quebec. When Louisiana was colonized, parishes were formed at Mobile, New Orleans, and the chief settlements. These were confided to the Capuchins, the Jesuits directing the Indian missions. In the year 1765 two Jesuits, Louis Lefranc and Peter du Jaunay, were still stationed at Mackinaw; the missions were abandoned after the suppression of the Society of Jesus. Father Potier (+ 1781) was the last of the illustrious missionaries around the great lakes. He occasionally visited Illinois also. During the American Revolution Rev. Mr. *Gibault* was alone left to attend to the French and Indians.

In 1673 Father Marquette had the pleasure of realizing his long-cherished desire of visiting the "great river," of which he had already made mention in a letter written in 1669. Accompanying the expedition of Louis Joliet, the envoy of the French Government, he left Mackinaw in May, 1673, and from the mouth of the Wisconsin floated down the majestic river, and passed the rivers Missouri and Ohio as far as the mouth of the Arkansas, preaching to the inhabitants of the lands which they passed. He returned by the Illinois River, visited the Peorias and Kaskaskias in Illinois, and then stayed for a while in Green Bay to recruit his health. After that, by order of his superior at Quebec, he established his dear Illinois mission, which, at his death in 1675, was continued by Allouez (+ 1690), Rale, Gravier, and others.

The Recollect Fathers *Hennepin* and *Zenobius Membre* — the latter of whom accompanied La Salle — continued the exploration begun by Marquette; but various attempts to establish missions in the Mississippi valley resulted only in the martyrdom of several missionaries. Fathers *Poisson* and *Souel* were martyred by the Natchez; *St. Côme*, by the Sitimachas; *Nicholas Foucault*, by the Tonicas. The labors of these holy men did not here reap such fruit as elsewhere had been the case; and at length the suppression of the Society of Jesus closed all the Jesuit missions in the lower valley of the Mississippi.

At Quebec, the most important place of Canada, whence, as we have seen, so many missionaries came forth, a bishopric was estab-

[1] Missionary Labors of Frs. Marquette, Menard, and Allouez. By *Rev. Chr. Verwyst, O. S. F.*

Digitized by Google

lished in 1675 through the influence of Louis XIV. The first holder of that high office was the illustrious Laval. The colony was ceded to England in 1763. This cession, however, did not stay the progress of religion.

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

§ 160. *Outbreak of the Schism in Germany.—Stand taken by Luther against Indulgences.—Measures taken by the Apostolic See.*

THE relative positions between the spiritual and temporal powers in the sixteenth century underwent an essential change, through the apostasy of several Christian nations from the Church; and their example exercised great influence on the relation hitherto existing between Church and State, even in Catholic countries.

The proximate occasion of the schism[1] in Germany was the indulgence published by Cardinal Albert of Brandenburg, Archbishop of

[1] The most important literature of this period is: 1. Of Catholic authors: *Cochlæus* (see § 162), Commentaria de actis et scriptis M. Lutheri, chronographice ab a. 1517–1546, fideliter conscripta. Mog. 1549, fol. *Surius* (a Carthusian in Cologne, + 1578), Chronicon ab a. 1500–1566. Colon. 1567. *Siméon Fontaine*, Hist. cath. de nostre tems touchant l'état de la religion, etc. Ant. 1558. *Raynald*, Annales ad ann. 1517 sqq. *Pallavicini*, Storia del Concilio di Trento. Roma, 1652. 3 vols. lat. of *Giottino*. Ant. 1673. *Bossuet*, Hist. des variations des églises protest. 2 vols. Paris, 1688. Œuvres de Bossuet, tom. xix. Versailles, 1816. *Maimbourg*, Hist. of Lutheranism. Paris, 1680. *Riffel*, Christ. Ch. Hist. since the great Schism in Faith and Church. 3 vols. Mayence, 1841 (1844). *Döllinger*, The Reformation: its Interior Development, etc. 3 vols. Ratisbon, 1846. *Döllinger*, Contributions to the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Cultured History of the last Six Centuries. 1 vol. Ratisbon, 1862. *Boost*, The Reformation in Germany. Ratisbon, 1845. *Buchholtz*, History of the Reign of Ferdinand I. 9 vols. Vienna, 1831. *Laemmer*, Monum. Vaticana hist. eccl. saec. XVI. illustrantia. Frib. 1861. *Rohrbacher*, Histoire universelle de l'église cath. 24 vols. *Janssen*, Hist. of the German People, 5 vols. (so far). *Evers*, Martin Luther. *Balan*, Monumenta Reform. Lutheran. Ratisbon, 1884.—2. Of Protestant authors: *Spalatini*, Annales ref. (to 1543) ed. *Cyprian*. Leips. 1718. *Myconii* (+ 1546), Hist. reform. a. 1518–1542 ed. *Cypr.* Leips. 1718. *Ratzenberger* (+1558), Manual on Luther, edit. by *Neudecker*. Jena, 1850. *Sleidani* (+1556), De statu relig. et reipublicae sub Carol. V. Caes. lib. xxvi. Argentor, 1555 sqq. Even Melanchthon is dissatisfied with the one-sided partiality of this work (Ep. ad Libium. Corp. Reform. viii. 483). *Seckendorf* (+ 1692), Commentarius hist. et apolog. de Lutheranismo (against Maimbourg). Frankf. and Leips. 1688, 4, 1692, fol. *H. v. d. Hardt*, Hist. lit. ref. Frcf. 1717, fol. *Basnage* wrote Hist. de la relig. des églises réf. 4 vols. La Haye, 1724. *Löscher*, *Kapp*, *Neudecker*, *Förstemann*, *Seidemann*, etc., edited various acts and records of this time. *Plank* is more impartial than his predecessors; he wrote "History of the Rise, Alterations, and Formation of our Protestant Doctrine to the

Digitized by Google

Mentz, at the command of Pope Leo X., the proceeds of which were to be applied to the building of St. Peter's Church in Rome, which had been commenced by Julian III.

Albert intrusted the publication of the indulgences to the so often calumniated John Tetzel, a Dominican of Leipsic. He was opposed by the Augustinian Martin Luther, born in Eisleben, 1483, in Saxony, who had been from the year 1508 professor at Wittenberg. He attacked the indulgences from the pulpit, and on the 31st of October, 1517, affixed his famous ninety-five theses to the doors of the church attached to the castle of Wittenberg, in order to provoke a discussion.

This action of Luther against indulgences, of the nature and import of which he confessed himself ignorant, had its true and proper motive, not in any exterior event, but in his own theological system, which denies the freedom of the will and the possibility of good works, making salvation depend on faith alone without the co-operation of man.[1]

How Luther came to these pernicious and erroneous views can be best seen from his own confessions.[2] Having entered the monastery without a true vocation, Luther, following the bent of his own scrupulous, self-tormenting mind, which was suffering from hypochondriac tendencies, first sought to obtain peace and happiness for his soul by pelagianism ("praesumptuosissimus justitiarius"),—that is, by a pharisaical practice of good works without the grace of God.

Formula of Concord." 7 vols. Leips. 1791. A quiet, historical representation is given in *K. A. Menzel's* New History of the Germans. 12 vols. Breslau, 1826. *Ranke*, German History in the Time of the Reformation. 3d ed. 6 vols. Berlin, 1852.

[1] De captivit. Babyl.: "Ita vides, quam dives sit homo christianus, *etiam volens non potest perdere salutem suam quantiscunque peccatis, nisi nolit credere.* Nulla enim peccata eum possunt damnare, nisi sola incredulitas. Caetera omnia, si redeat vel stet fides in promissionem divinam baptizato factam, in momento absorbentur per eandem fidem" (ed. Jen. ii. 264). This is even more forcibly expressed in his letter to Melanchthon, Aug. 1, 1521 (*De Wette*, ii. 27): "Esto peccator et pecca fortiter, sed fortius fide et gaude in Christo: qui victor est peccati, mortis et mundi, peccandum est, quamdiu hic sumus. Vita haec non est habitatio justitiae: sed expectamus, ait Petrus, coelos novos et terram novam, in quibus justitia habitat. Sufficit quod agnovimus per divitias gloriae Dei agnum, qui tollit peccata mundi: ab hoc non avellet nos peccatum, etiamsi millies uno die fornicemur aut occidamus. Putas tam parvum esse pretium et redemptionem pro peccatis nostris factam in tanto ac tali agno?" Even granted that this letter was written under excitement, and that therefore no great stress may be laid upon it, it is still of importance as showing the tendency of Luther's views.

[2] Luther's Own Statements, by Rev. *H. O'Connor*, S. J.

Digitized by Google

Finding his efforts fruitless, he went to the opposite extreme; renouncing moral freedom and the possibility of human co-operation in the affair of justification and salvation, he now based these on the grace of God alone, without penance, without moral improvement, — in fact, without any human co-operation whatsoever. The truth by which, indeed, man acknowledges himself a sinner, but with humble, childlike trust co-operates with the grace of God in working out his own sanctification, found no entrance into his mind.

Filled with these thoughts, and tormented by his persistent scrupulosity, Luther betook himself to the study of St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, in which he believed that he found alike a justification of his views and peace for his soul; in reality, he read these Epistles through the medium by which his torn and tormented heart had wrought the images with which it had filled his imagination.

In this way Luther had already framed his system before Tetzel's appearance on the scene, and had already, as professor, spoken from the pulpit words which his hearers declared to be in contradiction to the teaching of the Church.

The theses of Luther spread rapidly, and his undertaking assumed a greater importance than could have been at first sight expected. The political and religious condition of Germany at this time contributed greatly to this result. The hostility existing between the humanistic and the scholastic theologians, which was newly fostered by the contention of Reuchlin with the converted Jew Pfefferkorn; the fury of the knights of the empire against the clergy, at whose suggestion the Emperor Maximilian I. had put an end to the feuds and freebooting life which they had till then carried on; the disunion between the bishops and the magistracy in the imperial cities; and the enmity to Rome and the clergy existing in many places, — these combined circumstances brought to the side of the monk of Wittenberg many friends and adherents, who, though led by motives entirely different from his, tendered him their applause and espoused the cause he had undertaken.

There were also many well-disposed spiritual and temporal dignitaries, heartily desirous of promoting a true reformation of the Church, who at first lent their aid to forward Luther's propositions, but afterwards drew back when the real tendency of the new reform became patent to them.

Encouraged by such applause as this, Luther proceeded on the

Digitized by Google

path he had chosen, and replied to the writings of his adversaries — such as Sylvester Prierias, Tetzel, Conrad Wimpina, professor at Frankfort, and of Professor Hochstraten, a Dominican of Cologne — with spiteful and scornful invective; while, by composing works in German, he sought to win over the people to his side, and draw them into the contest.

The new reformer, whose opposition to the traditionary teaching of the Church became more and more apparent, proceeded with less hindrance from finding powerful protectors in his provincial, John von Staupitz, and in George Spalatin, Chaplain at the Court. The German bishops at first either looked on quietly or made but slight opposition.

As early as the year 1518, on the 3d of February, Pope Leo X. had commissioned Gabriel of Venice, Vicar-General of the Augustinians, to bring Luther to submission. This had no effect whatever. On the 30th of May Luther sent the explanations and proofs ("resolutiones") of his theses, with a letter, to the Pope.

The Emperor Maximilian described to the Pope the danger and gravity of the impending strife, and Leo, on August 1, cited the heretic to appear in Rome; but, yielding to the wish of the Elector Frederic of Saxony, he permitted Luther to be heard at Augsburg.

Accordingly, in October, 1518, Luther made his appearance at Augsburg, and had several conferences with the learned cardinal Cajetan (Thomas de Vio), but refused to make the desired recantation. He left the city secretly, leaving an appeal, duly witnessed before a notary, bearing the inscription: "From the ill-informed Pope to the Pope when better informed" ("A Papa male informato ad Papam melius informandum"). Cajetan vainly besought the Elector Frederic either to deliver up the dangerous heretic or to banish him from his dominion. Luther remained unmolested in Wittenberg, and in the self-same year won over to his side Philip Melanchthon, who was to play so important a part in this contest.

On the 9th of November, 1518, Pope Leo X. issued a bull in which he expounds the doctrine of the Church on indulgences; but before the bull arrived, Luther had, on the 28th of November, appealed from the Pope to an œcumenical council.

Under such circumstances, also, the efforts of the Pope's chamberlain, Charles von Miltitz, to effect peace were necessarily at fault; the unpliable soul of the monk remained unmoved. All that the pacificator could effect was that Luther promised to keep silence if his opponents would do the same.

Digitized by Google

§ 161. *Disputation at Leipsic, and its Results.*

One of the most renowned opponents of Luther was Dr. John Eck, the learned Vice-Chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt, who in his work called "The Obelisks," which was written at the request of the Bishop of Eichstädt, stated in short terms and fully disproved the objectionable propositions set forth by the Wittenberg reformer. Although the work was not intended for the public, it had a wide circulation, and induced Andreas Carlstadt, the tutor of Luther, to undertake the vindication of his pupil, in forty theses.

Hereupon a public disputation was agreed upon between him and Eck. This was accordingly held, from June 27 to July 16, 1519, in Leipsic. Luther, who had in his "Asterisks" replied in a vehement tone to Eck's "Obelisks," now took part in this discussion. The principal subjects in debate were: The freedom of the will, the divine institution of the primacy, and the precedence it bestowed on the primate over all other bishops. Neither Carlstadt nor Luther proved equal to this opponent; they were finally obliged to abandon the field, and Eck was saluted victor.

The defeat the "reformer" had undergone offended his vanity, and made him still more obdurate in his opposition to the Catholic Church. His friends vented their intrinsic choler on Eck, whom they insulted and calumniated after the coarsest fashion. In order to lead public opinion still more astray, Melanchthon published a false report of the disputation, in which several false accusations are brought against Eck. The latter defended himself, without touching on the subjects of disputation. The result was a pen polemic, in which Carlstadt took part, though in a somewhat clumsy manner. Luther, who had found a new adversary in the person of Jerome Emser, private secretary of Duke George of Saxony, could not refrain from the enjoyment of cooling his revenge by again attacking Eck, which obliged the latter also to break through the silence he had imposed on himself.

Shortly after the disputation, Eck in a letter to the Elector Frederic clearly showed the dangerous tendencies of Luther's doctrine, and called upon him to proceed against the heretic. His friends, however, found means to avert the threatened danger; and Luther, who had already resolved to flee into Bohemia, was enabled to remain tranquilly in Wittenberg. About this time the reformer entered into connection with the knights of the empire, whose rep-

resentative was the rapacious and brutal Francis of Sickingen. Encouraged by the countenance they afforded him, he overstepped all bounds; he set at nought the judgment pronounced by the Universities of Paris, Heidelberg, Cologne, and Louvain on the disputation at Leipsic, and separated himself from the Church more and more.

The Emperor Maximilian died in 1519, and his grandson Charles V. succeeded to the throne. Luther was solicitous to acquire the favor of the new emperor, who was crowned on the 22d of October, 1520, and with this object in view addressed a very humble letter to him; but as this remained unanswered, the reformer adopted another tone, and published his work addressed "To the Emperor and the Nobility of the German Nation, on the Improvement of Christian Morals."

In this work Luther formally cut himself off from the Church, by rejecting the hierarchy, denying the priesthood, and calling on the temporal power to convoke a council that should deprive the Pope of his spiritual and temporal power, abolish the taxes for Rome, abrogate the papal censures, limit the number of cardinals to twelve, permit the clergy to marry, and do away with masses for the dead, with vigils, and the commandments of fasting, abstinence, and the like. At the same time the reformer does not forget to hold out inducements to the German nobles, for whose advantage he wishes the revenues of the cathedrals to remain, and insinuates that they may possess themselves of the Church property; while he advises the emperor to dethrone the Pope, and thus do away with the feudal homage paid to him in fealty for Naples.

Meantime Eck had, on the 15th of July, 1520, effected the issue of a bull[1] in which Luther's doctrine was condemned in forty-one propositions; and Luther himself was commanded, on pain of excommunication, to retract within sixty days. The execution of this bull was committed to the papal legate Martin Caraccioli, to Jerome Aleander, and to Eck.

Notwithstanding its mild tone, the bull did not meet with the wished-for reception in Germany. In some places its publication was followed by stormy riots. Unfortunately, many bishops remained inactive, while the adherents of Luther made great efforts to weaken the impression made by the bull on the faithful. The reformer himself, who at that time published his works "On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church," "On the Mass," "On the

[1] Exurge Domine.

Digitized by Google

Liberty of a Christian Man," assailed the bull, and published his insulting pamphlet "On the New Eckian Bulls."

The Elector Frederic, misled by the superficial judgment of Erasmus, took the side of Luther, and declared that the matter should be submitted to the examination of impartial judges, and that Luther's teachings should be disproved by the authority of Scripture.

Luther, being in this way strengthened in his opposition to the Church, broke the last thread which yet connected him with it. He composed an execrable pamphlet, entitled "Against the Bull of Antichrist;" and on the 10th of December, 1520, he publicly burnt the bull at Wittenberg, together with the "Corpus juris canonici," after he had repeated his appeal for a general council.

A few months after these events, on April 21, 1521, the Sorbonne condemned the erroneous propositions of Luther, and Henry VIII. of England published his defence of the seven sacraments.[1] Luther answered with base insults. In the same unworthy manner he treated George, Duke of Saxony.

§ 162. *The Diet of Worms. — Luther's Sojourn on the Wartburg. — The Prophets of Zwickau. — Luther's Contest with Them.*

At the Diet of Worms, which was opened in February, 1521, the papal legate Aleander read a bull[2] of the 3d of January of the same year, by which Luther was formally excluded from the communion of the Church, and in a powerful speech called upon the emperor and the princes of the empire to proceed against the heretic, according to the laws of the empire against the excommunicated. But the Elector Frederic and some other adherents of Luther demanded that he should first be heard. Their request was granted. Furnished with an imperial safe-conduct, Luther appeared in Worms, acknowledged that the writings placed before him were his, but refused every recantation, and, rejecting alike the authority of the Pope with that of the œcumenical councils, demanded to be refuted from the Holy Scriptures.[3]

[1] Adsertio septem sacramenterum adv. Luth. London, 1521. Pope Clement bestowed upon him the title of "Defensor Fidei."

[2] Decet Romanum Pontificem. Bullar. Rom. v. 761 sqq.

[3] "I neither believe the Pope nor the œcumenical councils alone, since it is quite certain and manifest that they have frequently erred and contradicted themselves. My conscience is captive to God's Word. I neither can nor will recall anything. God help me! Amen." The words "Here I take my stand; I cannot do otherwise," are a later interpolation.

Digitized by Google

When all conciliatory efforts to reconcile the heretic with the Church had failed, Luther was dismissed; and on the 26th of May he was placed under the ban of the empire. He however found a protector in the Elector of Saxony, who had him brought to Wartburg, where he lived under the assumed name of Younker George. Here he composed many polemical works, and commenced his translation of the Bible into German, fitting it so as to suit his own system of belief.

During his sojourn at Wartburg, which he termed his Patmos, Luther completed his separation from the Church. The reproaches of his conscience he ascribed to the temptations of the Devil; and in the same degree as his soul was torn by distractions did he tear himself from the Church.

The Edict of Worms was published in the emperor's own inherited States and in the territories of several princes; but in the main it remained ineffective, because Charles left Germany soon after the diet, and the Government favored Luther's cause rather than combated it. Under these favorable circumstances the friends of Luther brought their principles to practical results. Bartholomew Bernhardi, Carlstadt, and others took wives. Gabriel Didymus in 1521 declared monastic vows to be diabolical, whereupon some monks in Saxony quitted their cells. In Wittenberg Carlstadt introduced the German Mass, administered Communion without previous confession and under both species, and had pictures and crucifixes destroyed.

Towards the end of the year 1521 the prophets of Zwickau, with Thomas Münzer, Nicholas Storch, and Marc Stübner at their head, came to Wittenberg, and in perfect consistency with Luther's system, maintained that infant baptism was useless, and that the exterior constitution of the Church needed revision and transformation. Carlstadt immediately joined them. Melanchthon wavered; and Luther, whom he consulted, gave undecided answers. It was not till Carlstadt and the prophets of Zwickau upset all order, declared war on knowledge, and even attempted to close the elementary schools, that Luther, on the 8th of March, 1522, left his Patmos (Wartburg), hastened to Wittenberg, and here, from the pulpit and by writing, commenced, with the aid of the secular power, to "rap these visionaries on the snout." He also came to an issue with his tutor, Carlstadt, who was at that time reforming in Orlamunde, and had inflicted on the "new pope" (Luther) the severest "cuff" by his doctrine regarding the Eucharist. Consequently, after a not

Digitized by Google

very edifying disputation at the inn of the Black Bear, in Jena, Luther succeeded in driving his adversary from Saxony. After having roved around for a long time, the unfortunate Carlstadt, by a humble recantation, obtained Luther's permission to return to Saxony. Soon, however, he fell out with Luther again, and was obliged to quit the country a second time. He was received at Basle, where he died in 1541.

§ 163. *The Popes Adrian VI. and Clement VII.— The two Diets at Nuremberg.*

Adrian VI., a German by birth, who succeeded Leo X., desired a thorough reformation with all his heart, and sent his legate Chieregati to the Diet at Nuremberg, September, 1522, to consult with the princes over the projected reforms. But instead of meeting the intentions of the noble Pope[1] on this ground, the princes handed to the papal legate the so-called *grievances of the German nation* in one hundred and one points, touching ecclesiastical matters which had already been brought forward at Worms. Meantime Luther remained unmolested in Wittenberg, notwithstanding the ban of the empire had been pronounced against him.

Adrian VI. died in 1523. His successor, Clement VII. (1523–1534), whose legate, Campeggio, attended the Diet of Nuremberg in 1524, was not more fortunate. The assembled princes promised, indeed, to "do what they could" towards enforcing the Edict of Worms, but at the same time they demanded that "a free Christian council should be held in a city of the German nation," and passed the resolution that the next diet, which was to be held at Spire, should determine what was to be done in matters of faith and religion until the council should be convened.

This decree satisfied neither the Catholics nor their opponents. The emperor, to whom the Pope applied, forbade the holding of the diet at Spire, and strictly commanded the execution of the Edict of Worms. Luther, who was already offended by the action of the diet, was indignant at the imperial command.

The papal legate, although unsuccessful at Nuremberg, was able at Ratisbon to effect an alliance, or rather a union, of the Catholic

[1] *Burmanni*, Analecta hist. de Hadr. VI. Traject. 1727. Adrian's judgment on Luther, l. c. p. 447. The beautiful instruction of the legate is found in *Le Plat*, Monum. ad hist. conc. Trident. potissimum illustrandam spect. ampl. collect. ii. 144 sqq.

Digitized by Google

princes, at the head of whom were the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, Dukes William and Louis of Bavaria, with twelve bishops of southern Germany. The object of this alliance or union was to protect the interests and institutions of the Catholic Church, and to enforce the Edict of Worms in their territories. At the same time they adopted a project of reformation.

§ 164. *The Peasants' War.*

While the new apostles of the Lutheran heresy, who were mostly clerics and monks who wanted to get married, were trying to spread their doctrine, under the title of the "purified gospel;" while they abused, slandered, and calumniated the Catholic Church and the priests in pamphlets, pictures, caricatures,[1] and the like, — a fearful catastrophe was being prepared for Germany, under the name of the Peasants' War.

In the year 1524 risings of the peasants had already taken place, which increased in extent in the following year; and fearful outrages were committed in Suabia, Alsatia, Franconia in the Rhine districts, in Thuringia, and Saxony.

In these revolts of the peasantry, with which also knights of the empire made common cause, Luther and his companions had no small share, as is proved by the following facts: —

1. The pamphlets of Luther, Hutten, and others, couched in fiery language, calling on people who were already bewildered by the predictions of astrologers, to shake off the yoke of the priests; and the boundless calumnies and insults heaped on such princes as closed their territories to the introduction of the purified gospel, could not but give a shock to the reverence due from the subject to the superior, and thus enkindle the fire of a revolt which must at length break forth into a terrible conflagration.

2. The chief speakers and leaders of the peasants were for the most part preachers and adherents of Luther.

3. Finally, the conduct of the peasants themselves, the claims they asserted, their zeal for Luther and for the pure gospel, together with their hatred of the Catholic clergy, and the outrages they committed on churches and convents, prove beyond all doubt what spirit it was that animated them.

[1] Among the caricaturists, the painter Lucas Kranach may be specially mentioned for his frivolous and obscene delineations or caricatures, to which Luther added explanations of the coarsest character.

Digitized by Google

Luther, while casting the responsibility of the insurrection on the Catholic bishops and priests, exhorted the peasants to submission in terms which did but increase their fury, as they were doing no more than carrying into effect the reformer's own principles.

On June 13, 1525, Luther married Catherine Bora, a nun of the Cistertian convent of Nimphschen, from which she had effected her flight through the good offices of Luther.

When the leaders of the insurrection had been defeated by the army of the Suabian Alliance, Luther changed his tone and called on the princes to slay the peasants like mad dogs. This vehement behavior no more frees the reformer from complicity in the dreadful civil war than does the fact that Thomas Münzer, an opponent of Luther, stood with his associates at the head of the rebellious peasants.

§ 165. *Introduction of the Lutheran Heresy by several Princes of the Empire. — Luther's Organization of Divine Service. — His Contest with Erasmus.*

Luther, having failed in his attempt to realize his designs by the help of the knights and the people, entered into a close alliance with the princes of the empire, to whom he intrusted the propagation and protection of his gospel. These, actuated by divers motives, for the most part not very honorable,[1] availed themselves of the opportunity to open the way for the pure gospel in their dominions. Of course they met with opposition.[2] Their subjects had anticipated something quite different, and did not desire to listen to the words of the Lutheran minister of the Word. But the advantages offered to the princes by the propagation of the Lutheran heresy were too enticing for them not to finish by force what had been begun by deception.

The new doctrine found a great friend in Albert, Margrave of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, who in 1525, following Luther's advice, took a wife, and secularized the territory

[1] Luther himself says: "Many continued to be good Evangelicals, because there still remain chalices, monstrances, and cloistral property" to be disposed of. *Mathesius*, p. 129.

[2] Cf. *Melanchth.* Ep. ad Kind. 1528. "Videmus quantopere nos odit vulgus." Corp. Ref. i. 941. The remark of Luther (1532) is worth noticing, that it stands in his power, "by two or three discourses, to lead the whole people back to popery, and establish new masses and pilgrimages." *Walch*, vii. 914.

Digitized by Google

of the order. The reformer was less fortunate in his attempts to win over Albert, Archbishop of Mentz, to espouse his cause. He found, however, a faithful ally in the person of Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, who in 1526 convoked a synod at Homberg, at which the apostate monk Lambert of Avignon spoke in favor of the new doctrine. Lutheranism was then introduced by force. In like manner heresy made its way into other territories.

These new partisans had not only the office of forcing the pure gospel on their subjects; they had also to assist in the organization of the new Church. (The "reformer" himself could only tear down; he knew not how to build up.) In a letter to the Elector of Saxony Luther complains bitterly of the evil consequences of the "pure gospel," and appeals to the temporal power for forcible assistance.

With the view of introducing some sort of order into the chaos of pure doctrine, the Lutheran princes were obliged to form special arrangements concerning the manner in which divine service was to be conducted in their respective countries.

The divine service, as arranged for Saxony, had the name and exterior ceremonies of the Mass. Luther, however, omitted the canon and everything in the collects that had reference to sacrifice. Yet, in order to mislead the people, he ordered this to be done in such a way that the common people should not observe it. With the same end in view, the Elevation was retained. Private Masses were entirely abolished. The remainder of the divine services consisted in singing, reading the Scriptures, and preaching. But as it soon came to be remarked that the preachers often reformed the new doctrines, and preached a gospel of their own, a system of parochial visitation was instituted in 1527, the visitors to consist of jurists and theologians, of which a commission of four was appointed by the rulers of the respective territories to exercise a general supervision over all ecclesiastical affairs. The preachers were, moreover, watched over by superintendents, and in 1542 consistories were established.

In the year 1527 Melanchthon composed his little book of "Visitation for the Preservation of Unity in Doctrine and Worship." This contained the Lutheran teachings, and informed the clergyman what doctrine he should preach. Luther had already published his postil "Collection of Explanations on the Gospels and Epistles." In the year 1529 he put forth his large and small Catechisms.

The progress of the new doctrine was in no way impeded by Luther's controversy with Erasmus on free-will. The renowned

Digitized by Google

Humanist controverted Luther's doctrine on the enslaved will; the latter replied, asserting his opinion in bold and abusive language. When Erasmus rebuked him for this, he toned down his abusive expressions, but did not renounce his errors, which Erasmus had termed in his second work an unheard-of doctrine. This terminated the controversy.[1]

§ 166. *The Treaty of Torgau.—The two Diets at Spire, in* 1526 *and* 1529.

After the termination of the Peasants' War, the Catholic States of the empire endeavored to suppress the religious innovations in their own territories, and to carry out the Edict of Worms. Neither did the Lutheran princes remain inactive. They held several preliminary consultations, and then in May, 1526, concluded the Treaty of Torgau, in which the members promised each other mutual assistance and support in introducing the new doctrine, in case they should be opposed in the work on the side of the empire.

At the head of this alliance were John, Elector of Saxony, and Philip, Landgrave of Hesse. The fruits of this bond were already apparent in June, 1526, when the diet was opened at Spire. The Lutheran States opposed the command of the emperor to carry out the Edict of Worms, and extorted the concession from the diet that until the next œcumenical council each State should, as far as regarded the edict, act according to its own best judgment, and be responsible for its conduct to God and the emperor.

That the adherents of Luther should take advantage of a position of affairs so favorable to them was to be expected. The emperor was involved in contention with the Pope and Francis I. of France, while his brother was hindered by the disorders in Hungary from energetic action elsewhere; they therefore could pay but little attention to matters in Germany. Conscious of their own strength, the Lutheran princes even thought of forming plans by which they should attack the Catholic members of the empire. As a pretext for this, a forged document of Otho of Pack, Chancellor of Duke George of Saxony, was produced to prove that a Catholic

[1] Erasmus published (1524) his "Diatribe de libero arb." Luther answered (1525) by his treatise "De servo arb." In this he maintains that the human will is a horse, ridden by God or the Devil; that God works the good and evil in us, etc. Erasmus replied by his "Hyperaspistes diatribae adv. serv. arb. Luth." 1526. (Op. Erasmi ed. *Cleric.* x. 1249 sqq.)

Digitized by Google

alliance had been formed for the suppression of the Lutheran States. The whole news of such a conspiracy was, however, proved to be false. But such events were calculated to destroy more and more a good understanding between the parties.

At the Diet of Spire, 1529, the concession of that of 1526 was rejected. It was stipulated that those princes and States that had heretofore followed the Edict of Worms should continue so to do until the next œcumenical council; that the others should abstain from making further innovations until the same time, while they were by no means to hinder their Catholic subjects from practising their religion. The Lutheran princes protested[1] against these articles, and sent their protestation to the emperor, who was then at Piacenza. The emperor returned an ungracious answer, on which the protesting princes sought, by the formation of new alliances among themselves, to secure their States from castigation by the emperor. Even the Zwinglians were to have been included in the alliance; but this plan was frustrated by their doctrine on the Lord's Supper, and it was in vain that Philip of Hesse sought to reconcile the contending parties.[2] The conference on religion at Marburg, Oct. 1, 1529, led to no good result; and the seventeen articles of Torgau, which contained the doctrine of Luther, hindered, at least for a time, every approach calculated to unite Luther to Zwingli.

§ 167. *The Diet at Augsburg,* 1530. — "*Confessio Augustana.*" — *Colloquies.*

When peace had been concluded at Cambray and at Barcelona (Aug. 5 and June 29, 1529), the Emperor Charles turned his serious attention to adjusting the religious difficulties in Germany, and for this purpose convoked a diet in 1530, to assemble at Augsburg. The diet was opened after the emperor had arrived; and the Protestant princes presented him with a symbol of faith, the so-called "Confessio Augustana." It was composed by Melanchthon, on the basis of the seventeen articles of Torgau, and was fully approved by Luther.

[1] Thence came the name "Protestants."

[2] Luther and Zwingli rejected transubstantiation. The former, however, taught that a certain presence of Christ was in the bread (doctrine of impanation); while the Swiss reformer, like Carlstadt, saw in the sacrament only a remembrance of Christ.

Digitized by Google

The "Augsburg Confession"[1] consists of two parts. The first twenty-one articles treat of the doctrine, and the seven articles following of the so-called abuses, among which are included, (1) Communion under one kind; (2) Celibacy; (3) Private Masses; (4) Compulsory confession; (5) Fast and abstinence commandments; (6) Monastic vows; (7) Episcopal power.

At the public reading of the Confession (June 25), there seemed to be no too great difference between Catholics and Protestants with regard to doctrine; but this was only because Melanchthon avoided touching on the principal points of Luther's doctrine, moderated many of his bold assertions, and laid the greater stress on the so-called abuses, which he treated with singular prolixity. Therefore the first impression made by this reading differed with individuals. The princes of the empire judged favorably concerning it, while men who looked deeper into the matter saw only a work of hypocrisy.

In this disposition the twenty theologians deputed by the emperor to examine the document set to work to write a confutation of it. Their production, however, which was occasionally couched in intemperate and caustic words, did not please the Catholic States of the empire; and it was not till after it had been five times re-written, and all offensive passages struck out, that the confutation of the Augsburg Confession was read in public session, August 3.

After this had been done, the emperor gave the Protestants to understand that they must return to the unity of the Church; as, should they refuse to do so, he would be obliged to proceed as his conscience would direct in his office as protector of the Church.

But the advocates of the Augsburg Confession would listen to no proposal of returning to the Church, and Melanchthon composed his "Apologia confessionis." The emperor, who did not accept this, hoped yet to set aside or adjust the schism by conferences, and at the instance of the Archbishop of Mentz appointed a commission composed of seven Protestants and an equal number of Catholics, to debate and come to an agreement on the points of difference. The discussion began on the 16th of August. The result could well have been foreseen. Melanchthon seemed willing to yield, and Eck to meet his wishes as far as possible. Yet nothing was forwarded by this; for apart from the fact that the underlying principles of Protestant belief and Catholic faith are essentially opposed to each

[1] Printed with the Apology in *Hase*, Libri symbol. eccl. evang. Leips. 1827, p. 5, sqq. and Prolegomena.

Digitized by Google

other, the Protestant States of the empire would not entertain any idea of a reconciliation with the Church. The Landgrave Philip of Hesse had already, on the 6th of August, left Augsburg without the knowledge or consent of the emperor. Luther sharply reproved Melanchthon for his apparent attempt to form a union,[1] and the latter yielded to the influence of Luther. Another conference of six members, held at the emperor's command, was equally unsuccessful.

After all the efforts of the emperor to effect a peace had proved of no avail, he had the draught of the final decree of the diet promulgated. The Lutheran States protested against it; the Lutheran cities of the empire united with them in doing so. The four cities of Lindau, Constance, Memmingen, and Strasburg had presented a confession of their own, "Confessio tetrapolitana." It was on the 19th of November that the final decree of the diet was published. It forbade all further innovations in religious matters, and commanded that the churches, cloisters, etc., should be restored to their former condition.

§ 168. *The League of Schmalkald.*

The Lutheran princes, who were deeply offended at the appointment of the emperor's brother Ferdinand as king of the Romans, one and all refused submission to the final decree of the diet. In March, 1531, they formed a league among themselves, called the Schmalkald League. This was a formal, offensive and defensive alliance for the period of six years. Luther and Melanchthon had revoked their former expressions of aversion to have recourse to arms in behalf of their religion.

In the following year the members of the league, which unfortunately had been joined by the dukes of Bavaria, by their persistent refusal to render assistance in the war against the Turks, extorted from the emperor the first religious peace of Nuremberg (July 23, 1532), by which all lawsuits in matters of religion were suspended. In making this stipulation the object of the Lutherans was to neutralize that clause of the "final decree" which was most repugnant to them, — that of restoring the Church property of which they had taken possession.

[1] "Quid enim minus unquam speravi et quid adhuc minus opto, quam ut de doctrinae concordia tractetur? . . . Summa, mihi in totum displicet tractatus de doctrinae concordia, ut quae plane sit impossibilis, nisi Papa velit Papatum suum aboleri." (Ep. ad Melanchth. 26 Aug.)

Digitized by Google

The concessions made by the emperor to the Schmalkald League, which had won a new ally in Ulrich of Würtemberg, and which had entered into secret compacts with France and England, did not produce the result he desired. After a short time new conflicts arose, and it was not till 1534 that peace was restored.

In 1535 the League of Schmalkald was renewed for ten years, and it was resolved that all who "freely and publicly should confess God and his gospel, love peace, and live as honest people," should be received into the alliance.

The chief purpose of this resolution was to win over the Zwinglians in the cities of the empire. Through the efforts of Martin Bucer this purpose was accomplished; a union between the Zwinglian cities and the Lutheran members of the league was concluded by the so-called Concordia of Wittenberg,[1] 1536, in which Zwingli's doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper was apparently given up. A union between the Swiss Church and the Lutheran princes was effected in 1538, after Luther had declared that he would lay no particular stress on the interpretation of Christ's words at the Last Supper.

§ 169. *Further Progress of Protestantism.—Attempts at Reunion.—Bigamy of Philip of Hesse.—Acts of Violence.—Diets at Spire,* 1542, 1544, *and at Ratisbon,* 1546.—*Luther's Death.—His Character.*

In compliance with the repeated demands of the Protestants, and to satisfy the wishes of the Catholic States, who expected from the measure the re-establishment of unity, Pope Paul III. (1534–1549) convoked a council which was to assemble at Mantua and be opened on the 23d of May, 1537.

But it soon became clear to every one that the call of the Protestants for an œcumenical council was a mere pretext; for neither the Lutheran princes nor their theologians consented to put in an appearance at Mantua, and they took exceptions against the synod held there on the ground that a council "the form and order of which was under the direction of the Pope could not be free." As if to render a reunion altogether impossible, they signed the twenty-three articles drawn up by Luther in February, 1537, called the "Articles of Schmalkald." These form a striking contrast with the Augsburg Confession, by bringing into sharp relief the points which Melanchthon had either silently passed over or at least had moderated,—as, for

[1] *Seckendorf,* Comment. hist. et apol. de Luth. iii. 132.

Digitized by Google

instance, Mass, purgatory, the veneration of saints, and the primacy.[1] The Protestant princes positively refused to attend the council.

This disposition of the members of the Schmalkald League rendered a collision inevitable, and induced the imperial vice-chancellor, Dr. Held, to effect a defensive alliance of the Catholic princes at Nuremberg, June 10, 1538. This was called the Holy League.

The Protestant party, which meantime had received new accessions from the apostasy of other princes and cities of the empire, held an assembly at Brunswick, which rejected the decisions of the Imperial Court "because the judges had not the true faith." Ferdinand, pressed by the Turks, entered into a treaty for sixteen months with the Protestant princes, at Frankfort, April 5, 1539, in which it was agreed that the Protestant States should be undisturbed by the Court of the Imperial Chamber, and that the religious perplexities should be adjusted by conferences. A new religious conference was opened at Hagenau, which was continued at Worms, December, 1540, and at the Diet of Ratisbon, 1541, at which the treatise known as the "Ratisbon Interim," served as the guide of the discussion. This produced no satisfactory result; for although the theologians found some points of agreement, the Protestant princes would not listen to any proposals of union. Instead of this, encouraged by their new allies, Joachim II. of Brandenburg, and Henry, brother and successor of Duke George of Saxony, they extorted from the emperor new concessions of greater importance than those granted to them at Ratisbon.

About this time (March 3, 1540) Philip of Hesse, whose lawful wife was still alive, took a second spouse, Margaret von der Saal, with the permission of Luther, who, fearing lest the landgrave might, as he threatened, return to the Catholic Church, signed the document of dispensation, as also did Melanchthon, Bucer, and five preachers or theologians from Hesse, on condition of its being kept secret.[2] This was done "to further the welfare of Philip's soul and body, and to bring glory to God."[3]

[1] At his departure from Schmalkald, Luther had called out to the preachers, "Deus vos impleat odio Papæ." Cf. Ep. ad Melanchth. Feb. 27, 1552. "Pestis eram vivus, moriens ero mors tua, Papa." (*De Wette*, v. 57.)

[2] "Quod si denique vestra Celsitudo omnino concluserit, adhuc unam conjugem ducere, judicamus id secreto faciendum, ut superius de dispensatione dictum, nempe ut tantum vestrae Celsitudini, illi personae, ac paucis personis fidelibus constet Celsitudinis vestrae animus, et conscientia sub sigillo confessionis."

[3] "Instrumentum copulationis Phil." etc. (*Bossuet*, l. c. i. 396.) The preacher

Digitized by Google

As early as the year 1534 an attack was made on the bishopric of Munster; the outrages committed by the Anabaptists,[1] however, prevented the introduction of the new doctrine. In the year 1542 the Elector John Frederic of Saxony expelled Julius von Pflug, the lawful bishop of Naumburg-Zeitz, and appointed in his place Nicholas von Amsdorf, whom Luther consecrated bishop after his own fashion. Henry, Duke of Brunswick, was in the same year attacked by the princes of the Protestant League, and compelled to flee the country. Lutheranism was then introduced into his States.

The attempt of the ignorant archbishop Herman von Wied to introduce, with the help of Bucer and Melanchthon, the new doctrine into the diocese of Cologne, was baffled by the vigorous resistance of the metropolitan chapter, of the clergy, and of the people. Like Francis of Waldeck, the unworthy prince-bishop of Munster, Minden, and Osnabrück, he was finally compelled by circumstances to resign.

In the prospect of adding more princes to their number, the Protestant leaders grew more and more insolent in their pretensions. Already, at the Diet of Spire, in 1542, they had demanded the abolition of all the lawsuits pending in the Imperial Chamber, and the proclamation of a steadfast peace, by which they meant that their robberies on Naumburg-Zeitz and Brunswick should be sanctioned. They again took exceptions about attending the Council of Trent, to which they were invited. The concessions made by Ferdinand had given them courage to proceed to new requisitions. At the Diet of Spire, in 1544, they extorted from the emperor, notwithstanding the opposition of the Catholic States, a final decree in which the rights of the Church in Germany are most frightfully violated.

The evil had now reached a high degree, but the rescue was at hand. In September, 1544, the emperor concluded the Peace of Crespy with Francis I. of France, and agreed on an armistice with the Turks. This enabled him to devote his whole attention to the religious difficulties of Germany. The Pope ordered the immediate reopening of the Council of Trent (March, 1545). Indignant at such a change of affairs, Luther wrote his work entitled "The Papacy at Rome an Institution of the Devil;" and the rebellious

Dionysius Melander, an apostate Franciscan, who had himself taken three wives, was the man who performed the ceremony.

[1] *Herm. v. Kerssenbroek*, Anabapt. furoris hist. narratio, 1564-1573.

Digitized by Google

princes, whose power was broken ("concussi") for the moment, commissioned their theologians to draw up a formula of reunion.

The shrewdest of these documents is that got up by Melanchthon, called the "Reformation of Wittenberg," according to which the only difference between Catholics and Protestants consists in the latter desiring Communion under both species, and the marriage of the priests. He attaches a peculiar importance to the episcopal power which he wishes to see properly maintained.

The emperor, notwithstanding the renewed opposition of the Protestant princes, who had been joined by the Elector Frederic of the Palatinate, still entertained the vain hope of settling the religious difficulties by a conference. With this purpose in view, a diet was held at Ratisbon, 1546; but it accomplished nothing. Before this diet was opened, Luther had died at Eisleben, Feb. 18, 1546. The last years of his life were imbittered by the controversies among his adherents, and by the continually increasing immorality at Wittenberg.[1] His indignation was also excited by the jurists, who persisted in regarding the marriages of apostate priests and monks as concubinages; and then again he vented his anger upon the Jews.[2]

With respect to Luther's individuality, he possessed a sparkling imagination, a popular and captivating eloquence; he was untiring in ability to work, and unselfish in character. Yet he lacked the essential qualities of a true reformer. For the divine office of teaching, inherent in the Church, he substituted his own authority,[3] which, in glaring contradiction with his own principle of free inquiry, he sought to maintain in so irritable a manner that it clearly showed that the slightest opposition was absolutely insupportable to him. Lacking the power of clear, consistent, penetrative thought, carried away by his passions, he often became implicated in contradictory statements; he inconsiderately made assertions which, when they stood in his way, he as inconsiderately rejected.[4] He declared the

[1] It was especially bad in Wittenberg itself. On the 9th of March, 1545, Luther wrote to Prince George of Anhalt: "In ista Sodoma et Babylone vivimus, vel mortificamur potius." (*De Wette*, v. 722.)

[2] Shortly before his death Luther wrote to Catherine Bora (Feb. 1, 1546): "When the main business is settled, I must set to work to drive away the Jews." (*De Wette*, v. 784.)

[3] His "Sic volo, sic jubeo," are well known; he denies salvation to those who do not accept his doctrine. (*Janssen*, Second Answer to his Critics, p. 70 sqq.)

[4] On the 12th of May, 1531, Luther rejected the conditional baptism of children (Letter to Link), and on the 13th of May of the same year he approved it (Letter to

Digitized by Google

Holy Scriptures to be the only rule of faith; yet when in conflict with the Sacramentarians, or when cornered by any other exigency, he did not hesitate to appeal to ecclesiastical tradition. A zealous defender of the divine origin of the Scriptures, he does not shrink from rejecting whole passages when they displease him,[1] or of setting himself absolutely above the Scriptures by an appeal to Christ.[2] Dishonest in polemics, Luther frequently distorts the teachings of the Church or the assertions of his opponents; he first caricatures them, and then assails this phantom of his own imagination with bitter sarcasm. Hateful invectives and unbecoming jests often supply the want of reasonable arguments. The frivolous and low language of his writings can in no degree be excused by the coarseness of the age. Luther pursued his opponents with an irreconcilable hatred.[3] "Courageous even to temerity in prosperity, he was cowardly even to abjectness in adversity." (*Pallevicini.*)

The undoubting conviction of his divine mission, which animated him under excitement, was in his tranquil moments often changed to the most fearful agitation of conscience, which filled his mind with unbearable doubts about the truth of his system.[4] These constantly recurring admonitions of his conscience he declared to be assaults of the Devil, and sought to rid himself of them by the use of intoxicating drinks,[5] by unseemly jests, and by furious attacks

Osiander). See *De Wette*, iv. 254 sqq. He acted in like manner in his controversy on the sacraments.

[1] At the Leipsic disputation he called the Epistle of St. James an epistle of straw. (*Walch*, xiv. 104.)

[2] "Quodsi adversarii scripturam urserint contra Christum, urgemus Christum contra scripturam. Nos dominum habemus, illi servum, nos caput, illi pedes seu membra, quibus caput oportet dominari et praeferri. Si alterutrum sit amittendum, Christus vel lex, lex est amittenda, non Christus." (Op. lat. ed. Wittenb. i. 387.)

[3] See his conduct to Carlstadt (§ 162), to Erasmus (§ 165), to George, Duke of Saxony, and others. His old friend Agricola, with whom he had fallen out, came to Wittenberg for the express purpose of being reconciled with him. Luther would not admit him to his presence. (*Döllinger*, iii. 265, etc.)

[4] Mathesius states: "A. Musa, at that time parish priest at Rochlitz, once vehemently complained to Dr. Martin [Luther] that he could not himself believe what he taught to others. 'Praise and thanks be to God,' responded Dr. Martin, 'that other people feel as I do! I thought I had such experience all to myself.'" (12 Sermon. p. 131.)

[5] Luther gives this advice to Jerome Weller (Nov. 6, 1530): "Et quoties istis cogitationibus te vexaverit Diabolus, illico quaere confabulationem hominum aut largius bibe, aut jocare, nugare aut aliquid hilarius facito. Est nonnunquam largius bibendum, ludendum, nugandum atque adeo peccatum aliquod faciendum in odium et contemptum Diaboli. . . . Quid causae aliud esse censes, quod ego sic meracius

Digitized by Google

upon the Pope,[1] against whom he thought himself allowed to do anything and everything.

The views of Luther regarding virginity, matrimony, conjugal fidelity, and the like, as expressed by him in speeches, sermons, and writings, are offensive not only to every religious sentiment, but to every feeling of delicacy and refinement in civilized life.

His own life was wanting in so many of the virtues that would have been becoming to a reformer of the Church, that it alienated, in his latter days, many of his former admirers and adherents. That in spite of this he would become an object of exaggerated veneration to the after world was foretold by himself in mocking words.[2] He dealt a heavy blow to the Catholic religion, yet one which was eventually to cause a fountain of renewed life to flow for her.

§ 170. *The Schmalkaldic War. — Treaty of Passau. — Religious Peace of Augsburg.*

The opposition of the Protestant League to the emperor assumed by degrees so violent a form that a peaceful settlement of existing differences could no longer be thought of. The chiefs of the league had well foreseen this result, and had made the necessary preparations for the conflict. Neither did Charles, "who alive or dead wanted to be still Emperor of Germany," remain inactive, but sought rather to strengthen his small forces. In the mean time the revolt of the allies, who had laid siege to the city of Füssen, had come to a crisis. Elector John Frederic of Saxony and Landgrave Philip of Hesse were placed under the ban of the empire. Duke Maurice of Saxony, a Protestant, joined the forces of Charles. The emperor first defeated the rebels in southern Germany, and then destroyed the army of the Elector of Saxony in a battle near Mühlberg, 1547. His territory and dignity were alike conferred on Maurice. Philip of Hesse was also compelled to surrender.

The insolence of the rebel princes was now broken, and the em-

bibam, liberius confabuler, comesser saepius, quam ut ludam Diabolum et vexem." (*De Wette*, iv. 188.)

[1] Cf. Ep. ad Joh. Lange (Aug. 18, 1520): "Nos hic persuasi sumus, papatum esse veri et germani illius Antichristi sedem, *in cujus deceptionem et nequitiam*, ob salutem animarum *nobis omnia licere* arbitramur." (*De Wette*, i. 478.) In his letter to Nicholas Hausmann (Jan. 10, 1527), he announces the fall of the papacy: "Papa ubique visitatur, ut destruatur, venit enim finis et hora ejus." (*De Wette*, iii. 154.)

[2] "Adorabunt stercora nostra et pro balsamo habebunt." (*Walch*, xxii. 1906.) Regarding the teachings of the Reformers, see § 196.

Digitized by Google

peror was master in Germany; yet unfortunately he made no further use of his victory than to convoke the diet in Augsburg in 1547, where the famous Augsburg Interim was resolved on, which satisfied neither Protestants nor Catholics. Some Protestant princes refused to admit it into their dominions; others had great difficulty in doing so. Even the newly appointed elector Maurice of Saxony would not unconditionally receive it, but had the Leipsic Interim prepared by his own theologians. Melanchthon, who drew up this document, yields to the Catholics in the Adiaphora;[1] he also retains the two sacraments of confirmation and of extreme unction. But as he adds that the bishops, whose jurisdiction is already acknowledged, must give their assent to the other points of doctrine contained in this Interim, he thus leaves open a back door.

The hard-tried emperor seemed at last to have arrived at the accomplishment of his wishes. Several Protestant States responded to his call, and sent deputies to the Council of Trent, now reopened by Pope Julius III. Even the Saxon theologians, among them Melanchthon, who had prepared a new, weighty symbol of faith, were on their way thither, when the traitorous Maurice of Saxony, conjointly with some other Protestant princes, suddenly baffled all the emperor's plans.

On the 5th of October, 1551, he formed a secret alliance with Henry II. of France, to whom he conceded the imperial cities Metz, Toul, Verdun, and Cambray. Then he, on May 2, 1552, suddenly fell upon the emperor, who lay sick in the city of Innspruck, under the pretext that "he [the emperor] wished to reduce the German States to an intolerable, brutal, and hereditary slavery." At the same time the French invaded the Netherlands.

The emperor did not take up arms against the rebels, but commissioned his brother Ferdinand to conclude the Treaty of Passau, July 30, 1552, with the Protestant States, and on Sept. 26, 1555, also the so-called Religious Peace of Augsburg.[2] The "Ecclesiastical Reser-

[1] Under this term are included all mediate articles, in themselves indifferent; such as certain ceremonies, the use of choir surplices, lights on the altar, etc. See § 197.

[2] The chief conditions of this peace are: That the States of the empire adhering to the old religion and those belonging to the Confession of Augsburg (the Zwinglians and Calvinists were excluded) shall fully enjoy equal freedom of worship, and in no way obstruct each other in the practice of religion. Even the decision respecting the religion of their territories is left to them ("jus reformandi; cujus est regio, illius

Digitized by Google

vation" ("Reservatum eccl."), which decreed that clerics who should leave the old religion should be deprived of their offices and benefices, still caused great difficulties. Peace was not yet restored.

§ 171. *The Reformation (so-called) in Switzerland.— Ulric Zwingli.*

In Switzerland the innovations were first introduced into the canton of Zurich, where Ulric Zwingli had, since the year 1518, preached in the great minster. Zwingli, who was more of a Humanist than a theologian, and who led a very immoral life, at length came forward as a reformer of the Church and an improver of social morals. In Glarus and Einsiedeln he had already in his sermons attacked time-honored usages of the Church, and had given scandal to the people by his licentious conduct; but it was only when the preacher of indulgences, Bernhardin Samson, appeared in 1519, that he found opportunity to come forward yet more publicly. He then attacked not only the Franciscan preacher, but the doctrine itself, and in the year 1520 obtained from the Great Council of Zurich a decree in which all the parish priests of the canton were commanded to preach only what they could prove with clear and distinct words from the Bible. The efforts of the Bishop of Constance to stem the torrent of heresy were ineffectual. Zwingli replied to his pastoral letter with haughtiness and contempt; and in the year 1522 he demanded, in reference to his "dishonorable and disgraceful life," that the bishop and the confederates should permit marriage to the clergy.

The kind and affectionate letter of Pope Adrian VI., of Jan. 23, 1523, entirely failed of its purpose to change the mind of the dis-

et religio"). If, however, subjects desire to emigrate on account of religion, no higher travelling tax shall be exacted of them than of other travellers. The episcopal jurisdiction over those belonging to the Augsburg Confession was suspended. Such Church property as was taken by them before the Treaty of Passau shall be included in the peace. In the cities of the empire in which both religions have hitherto been practised, it shall so continue, etc. The Protestants in the Catholic States, and later on in the spiritual territories, required free exercise of religion for those sects related to the Confession of Augsburg, whereas they themselves were only willing to grant toleration to the Catholics under their government, on condition that they should abstain from all public exercise of their faith and the ceremonies connected with it." The Catholic States would not assent to this; but Ferdinand complied with their demand in an accessory declaration. See *Menzel*, iii. 568 sqq.

Digitized by Google

obedient priest. In the same year the religious conference at Zurich took place, Jan. 29, 1523. For this, Zwingli had prepared his sixty-seven theses. The Catholic side was represented by John Faber, Vicar-General of Constance. He convicted Zwingli of error, yet the conference declared Zwingli the victor. A second conference was held in October, 1523, with the same result, through the partiality shown by the council. The reformer, thus encouraged, and aided by Leo Judæ, Louis Hetzer, and others, became still bolder. Several of his clerical adherents took wives. Zwingli himself married the widow Anna Reinhard, with whom he had for many years previously lived in sinful intercourse.

The chief motive which influenced the magistrature of Zurich in tolerating the innovations had its foundation in the wish to retain possession of the Church lands, the gold and silver vessels, and the like. It was this consideration that caused the defence of the teaching and arrangements of the Catholic Church, made by the Bishop of Constance, to fall unheeded, and that the earnest representations of an assembly at Lucerne, in 1524, could as little prevail on the Great Council to change their hostile attitude. Even the outrages perpetrated by Felix Manz, Blaurock, and other Anabaptists, who had come to Zurich, could not retard the progress of the so-called Reformation. On Zwingli's motion, the council forbade in 1525 the sacrifice of the Mass; ordered the demolition of altars, pictures, crucifixes, organs, and the like; and introduced the new action or custom of the Lord's Supper. Whoever refused to take part in this service of God was punished; and in 1529 attendance at Mass, even in another canton, was forbidden. Zwingli conferred the episcopal power of jurisdiction on the temporal power. On the synod, which was entirely dependent upon it, devolved the care duly to uphold Christian discipline.

The example of Zurich was followed at Basle, where, as early as the year 1527, Wolfgang Capito, Roublin, and others had preached the new errors, but had been opposed by the magistrates. It was John Œcolampadius who first broke down the opposition. Under his leadership the innovators, who, in 1527, had succeeded in extorting toleration for themselves, proceeded to take the offensive, — excluded the Catholic members from the Great Council, forced an entrance into the churches (where they destroyed altars and pictures, as had been done in Zurich), and introduced Zwinglianism. The same year the same thing happened at St. Gall, in Schaffhausen, where Sebastian Hofmeister preached the heresy, which had also

Digitized by Google

been received at Mühlhausen and Appenzell as early as the year 1524. In Glarus the innovators were victorious in 1528.

In Berne the Great Council at first resisted the introduction of Zwinglianism, but with too little firmness; and after the Catholic members had withdrawn, the priest Berthold Haller (+ 1536) succeeded in gaining the favor of the council for the cause of Zwingli. A religious conference of 1528 decided for the victory of the heresy, which was then introduced by severe measures throughout the whole canton. The Zwinglians also gained a footing in Graubünden.

The original cantons Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, as also those of Lucerne, Zug, and Freiburg, remained faithful to their religion. The proximate consequence of the religious revolution was the complete alienation of the Protestant from the Catholic cantons. In self-defence against the allied Protestant cantons, the Catholic cantons entered into an alliance with King Ferdinand of Austria; but when on the point of breaking out, the impending struggle was for the time averted by the mediation of the cities of Strasburg and Constance.

The acts of violence perpetrated by the leaguers of Zurich, which were carried to the length of intercepting convoys of provisions destined for the Catholic cantons, caused at length the outbreak of a furious war. The battle of Cappel, on Oct. 11, 1531, resulted unfavorably for the Zwinglians. (Zwingli himself was among the slain.) When peace was concluded, the victors behaved with great moderation.

§ 172. *The so-called Reformation in French Switzerland.— John Calvin.*

After the battle near Cappel (1531), Berne undertook to protect Zwinglianism, which it also sought to introduce into the French part of Switzerland. William Farel, Peter Viret, and others had endeavored from the year 1532 to introduce this heresy, but without much result until Berne came to their assistance. The Bishop of Lausanne was driven from his diocese. The troops were accompanied by preachers, who took forcible possession of the churches and therein preached their heresies. (Every opposition on the part of the people and of the clergy was suppressed by force;) and after a discussion (so called) on certain points of faith, the introduction of Zwinglianism was decreed by authority.

Digitized by Google

But the rich commercial city of Geneva was an especial aim of the innovators. The disputes of the city with the Duke of Savoy and the Prince-Bishop Peter de la Baume were well fitted to serve their purpose. For the maintenance of its own independence, Geneva had formed an alliance with Freiburg and Berne on city rights. This alliance Berne used in favor of Zwinglianism. Things turned still worse when Freiburg receded from the alliance. The Council of Geneva finally yielded to the stern demands of its ally; it renounced allegiance to the prince-bishop, who was connected with the Duke of Savoy, and who at a critical moment had left the city (1535). It permitted the images to be destroyed, the pictures and crucifixes to be torn down without remonstrance, and, finally, forbade the exercise of the Catholic religion.

This introduction of new ideas into Geneva was chiefly a political work effected by those in power; and its consequences were shown in the decline of social, moral, and ecclesiastical order. It was in vain that the leaders of the heresy did their best to bring about a well-ordered state of affairs; licentiousness continued to spread until, finally, it gained the upper hand.

At this critical moment John Calvin (Chauvin)[2] arrived at Geneva, where his heresy soon obtained the victory over Zwinglianism. Calvin was born, July 10, 1509, at Noyon, in Picardy, and pursued his studies at Paris, Orleans, and Bourges; and it was at Paris that he first came forward as a defender of the reformatory principles, which he had been influenced to adopt by the Humanist Melchior Volmar. This first attempt failed, being put down by the French Government. In consequence of his extremely intemperate assaults on the Catholic religion, Calvin, being pursued by the authorities, wandered about hither and thither, — in France itself for a while; till, in 1535, he betook himself to Basle, where he published his "Institutiones Christianæ," addressed to Francis I. From Basle he went to Ferrara on a visit to the Duchess Renata, who was desirous of learning the new doctrine. Thence, at the request of Farel, he took up his residence at Geneva.

[1] On the introduction of the so-called Reformation, see Histoire de M. Vuarin et du rétablissement du Catholicisme à Genève, par M. l'abbé *Martin*, miss. apost., etc., et M. l'abbé *Fleury*. Paris, 1862.

[2] *Calv.*, Op. ed. Genev. 1617, 12 vols. fol. ed. *Baum*, *Cunitz*, *Reuss*. in Corpus Reformat. tom. xxix. sqq. *Beza*, Hist. de la vie et de la mort de J. Calvin. Genève, 1564. *Bolsec*, Hist. de la vie, mœurs, actes, doctrine de J. Calvin rééditée par *Chastel*. Lyon, 1875.

Digitized by Google

The arbitrary principles and harsh behavior of the new reformer made him an object of hatred to the Genevese, of which he finally became the victim. (Calvin, Farel, and Courault were driven from the city in 1538.)

Calvin went to Strasburg, where he married the widow of an Anabaptist, and took part in the religious conferences of Hagenau and Ratisbon. Then, at the invitation of his adherents, he returned to Geneva in 1541, where, from that time forth, he wielded a power which was well-nigh absolute, and of which he made the most extensive use. In the first place, he regulated the ecclesiastical government.[1] The chief part of the worship consisted in sermons and catechetical instructions; special prayers and psalm-singing were also ordained. The whole worship was cold and formal. All images and other ornaments were removed from the church. The administration of the Eucharist took place four times a year. Calvin wished also to introduce a sort of confession. For the maintenance of moral discipline, a consistory, composed of preachers and laymen, was instituted. This was a most fearful inquisitorial tribunal, which was allowed to encroach upon the sacred rights of family life. The members of this tribunal were to keep watch over the conduct, church-going, etc., of every individual, and to punish the guilty. Another commission, of which Calvin was likewise the ruling spirit, had the regulation of the administrative and of the political ordinances, as also of those appertaining to the police.

The ecclesiastical as well as the civic ordinances contained the most stringent measures, which were carried out with the utmost severity.[2] It was a real yoke of slavery that now lay on the neck of the Genevese. Their domestic, equally with their public, life was subjected to the strictest control. Even allowable pleasures — family festivals, popular amusements, and the like — were forbidden. They were not even allowed to visit the bar-room. The old families of the city were not willing to submit to a state of such degrading pupillage; but Calvin had anticipated any attempt at revolt. He

[1] Ordonnances ecclésiastiques de l'église de Genève. Printed in Richter's Evangelical Church Ordinances of the Sixteenth Century, i. 342 sqq.

[2] *Galiffe* (Nouvelles pages d'histoire exacte sur le procès de P. Ameaux, Genève, 1863, p. 97) gives the number of arrests during the years 1542–1546 as amounting to 800–900. *Kampschulte* (John Calvin, his Church and his State in Geneva, vol. i.) gives an appalling description of the inhuman severity exercised in judicial proceedings and executions, and, in conclusion, says, "Human life seemed to have lost all its value at New Geneva."

Digitized by Google

had used his influence with the smaller council to secure the right of the city to the numerous French fugitives; and by this he had acquired a large number of adherents, with whose help he put down all opposition.

As in Geneva, so also in the rural congregations, where the populations for a long time resisted the introduction of the "pure gospel," it was by a despotism [1] of force that the heresy made its way.

And yet, although Calvin for the most part adhered so obstinately to his own opinion, he did not hesitate to modify that opinion when, by so doing, he could gain a momentary advantage. It was only towards the Catholic Church that he was implacable. As a theologian, Calvin was far superior to the superficial Zwingli; also he far surpassed Luther in erudition and general consistency. The characteristics of the reformer are haughtiness, harshness, and bitterness. In his treatment of his opponents he resembles Luther, particularly in his use of abusive language. The latter is more given to the exhibition of a furious and insolent wrath, while with Calvin the malice is more profound and bitterness predominates.[2]

The nature of the Genevan reformer was essentially aristocratic; while theoretically defending the sovereignty of the people, he practically decided in favor of an oligarchy. With regard to the relationships subjects bear to their superiors, Calvin gives utterance to the most dangerous sentiments,[3] which have been reduced to practice by his adherents in France.

[1] *Kampschulte*, p. 448. *Galiffe*, l. c. pp. 40, 115 sqq. The civil officers had strict orders to suppress every Catholic manifestation. In each separate congregation watchers were appointed to oversee the inhabitants. A peasant who did not eat meat on Friday or Saturday was imprisoned.

[2] In the Instit. Christ. iv. 20, n. 31, he calls his opponents "Blaterones, nebulones, nugatores, phrenetici, insulso cavillo ludentes, ore rabido latrantes, insulse stridentes, rabulae, sacrilegi, nebulones prodigiosi, calumniatores, helleboro magis quam argumentis digni, canes impuri, angues, angues tortuosi, furiosae belluae, porci." Cf. *Bossuet*, Hist. des variations, ix. 82.

[3] Cf. Instit. Christ. iv. 20, n. 31: "At vero in ea quam praefectorum imperiis deberi constituimus obedientia, id semper excipiendum est, imo in primis observandum, ne ab ejus obedientia nos deducat, cujus voluntati regum omnium vota subesse, cujus decretis jussa cedere, cujus majestati fasces submitti par est." Cf. n. 30: "Nam modo ex servis suis manifestos vindices excitat, ac mandato suo instruit, qui de scelerata dominatione poenas sumant et oppressum injustis modis populum e misera calamitate eximant." If we take into consideration the fact that, according to the views of Calvin and his followers, all Catholic kings, princes, rulers, and the like, are the enemies of God, the practical consequences of the above-named principles may be estimated. Certainly Calvin desires that even a tyrannical government should be obeyed, but such injunctions become illusory through the theory laid down above.

Digitized by Google

In order to establish his heresy on a firmer foundation, and to give it a wide scope, Calvin, in 1558, founded an academy in Geneva, which afterwards fell under the direction of Theodore Beza. This man had studied under Melchior Volmar, and after spending the years of his youth in profligacy, became a disciple of Calvin. At the death of the latter, Beza became head of the reformed congregations in Switzerland and France (+ 1605).

To be treated at length

§ 173. *Protestantism in France.*

In no other country did the prospects for the spread of Protestantism appear to be so favorable as in France,[1] the relations of which to the Apostolic See and to the German Empire seemed alike to favor the Reformation. At an early date the works of Luther, Zwingli, and others were circulated and eagerly read. The first Protestant congregation was formed in Meaux, under the leadership of Farel and Le Clerc.

At first the royal court took no measures against the innovators; in fact, Francis I. (+ 1547) commissioned the two brothers William and John du Bellay to enter into negotiations with the German Protestants. On the other hand, however, the Sorbonne and the Parliament were all the more severe in their proceedings against the sectarians.

A vigorous dealing with the new sect, which was patronized by Margaret de Valois, the king's sister, and the Duchess d'Etampes, the king's mistress, was all the more necessary from the grievous crimes which the adherents of the innovations permitted themselves to commit against the Catholic Church and against her Head.

On the 27th of June, 1551, Henry II.[2] published the Edict of

[1] Very important information on the so-called Reformation in France is given in the "Collection complète des mémoires relatifs à l'histoire de France, par *Petitot*, tom. xvii. sqq., Paris, 1821," which contains the memorable events in the lives of the most eminent men of this time. See, also, *Thuanus* (De Thou), Hist. sui temporis (1543–1607). 7 vols. fol. London, 1733. *Maimbourg*, Hist. du Calvinisme. Paris, 1862. *Berthier*, Hist. de l'église Gall. Paris, 1749. *Mezeray*, Abrégé chron. de l'histoire de France, tom. iii. Paris, 1717. *Davila*, Storia delle guerre civile di Francia 1559–1598. Venet. 1630. *Lacretelle*, Hist. de France pendant les guerres de rel. 4 vols. Paris, 1815 sqq. *Capefique*, Hist. de la réforme, de la ligue et du règne de Henri IV. 4 vols. Paris, 1834. *Sismondi*, Précis de l'histoire des Français, 2 vols. Bruxelles, 1839; and Histoire des Français, Aix-la-Chapelle, 1838.

[2] Henry II. (+ 1559) left four sons: Francis II., Charles IX., Henry III., and Francis, Duke of Alençon.

Digitized by Google

Chateaubriand, by which the inquisitorial jurisdiction over heresies was transferred to the civil power. In September, 1555, he conceded the right of decision to the bishops, while the execution of the sentence still remained to the secular courts. Notwithstanding these measures, the sects made no small progress in number.

The reformers, called Huguenots,[1] who had already formed congregations at Paris, Orleans, Rouen, Lyons, Angers, etc., and held their first national council in Paris in 1559,[2] became still more powerful during the reign of Francis II. The laws against heretics were, indeed, still in force; but the heretics themselves were protected by Prince Anthony of Bourbon, King of Navarre, and his brother Prince Louis of Condé, who, vexed at the influence exercised over the king by the Duke Francis of Guise and his brother, Cardinal of Lorraine, had made common cause with the Huguenots. Their chief leader was the Admiral Coligny.

Countenanced by such friends as these, the Huguenots formed a conspiracy, known as the Conspiracy of Amboise, to seize the person of the king and transfer the government to the two princes (1560). The French and German theologians and jurists of the sect approved of the plan, but the undertaking was discovered in time.[3] The leader, La Renaudie, was put to death; while the real author of the conspiracy, Prince Condé, escaped the penalty which he had so well deserved.

The Edict of Romorantin, in May, 1560, conceded to the bishops the right of inquiry into heresy. The secular power was only to proceed against rebellious and tumultuous assemblies. On the 20th of August Coligny presented to the notables at Fontainebleau a petition, in the name of the Huguenots, which had the effect of staying all judicial proceedings against them. In December the States-General were to meet at Meaux; however, they met, not at Meaux,

[1] On this name of Huguenot compare *Daniel*, Hist. de France, éd. *Griffet*, x. 54. Some derive it from Eidgnots, — that is, confederates bound to one another by oath; others, from King Hugo (Capet), who, in the popular belief, still haunts Tours by night as a ghost.

[2] Here a profession of faith ("Confessio Gallicana") was drawn up, and a system of discipline prescribed. This creed, or "symbolum," was presented to Charles IX. in 1561, and in 1566 was translated into Latin. In it the execution of heretics was declared to be a duty in the magistrate: "Ideo etiam gladium in Magistratuum manus tradidit [scl. Deus] reprimendis nimirum delictis, non modo contra secundam tabulam, sed etiam contra primam commissis." (*Augusti*, Corp. lib. symb. p. 145.)

[3] *Bossuet*, Hist. des variations, x. 23. They wished, however, to have a prince of the blood at their head.

Digitized by Google

but at Orleans. The Prince of Condé was present; but as he had attempted to take possession of the city of Lyons, he was arrested as a traitor and condemned to death. Only the sudden death of the king (December 5) prevented his execution.

The king's brother, Charles IX., now ascended the throne of France. As he was still under age, his intriguing mother, Catherine de Médicis, undertook the government. She was bent on making both Catholics and Protestants serve her own purposes; but by this dishonest policy she betrayed the weakness of the court party, and strengthened that of the Huguenots yet more in their opposition.

The appointment of Anthony of Bourbon as Lieutenant-General of France was favorable to the Calvinists. The edict of July, 1561, however, forbade their assemblies, and threatened sentence of death to obstinate heretics. But this edict did not prevent the Huguenots from holding meetings, which Catherine not only tolerated, but, to please the Admiral Coligny, she brought about a religious conference at Poissy (September 3), at which the Protestants were principally represented by Beza and Peter Martyr Vermilio, while the Catholic side was taken by the Cardinal of Lorraine, Claude d'Espence, De Xaintes, and the Jesuit Lainez. The conference ended, without result, on the 25th of November. On the 17th of January, 1562, the regent, out of hatred to the triumvirate,[1] issued the Edict of Toleration,[2] which allowed the Huguenots free exercise of their religion in the open country, but forbade their assembling for religious worship in the cities.

Such a concession, however, could not satisfy this party, which was so strongly opposed to the Catholic Church. They did not seek toleration for their sect; their object was the total annihilation of the Catholic Church in France. As long as they were yet weak they had to content themselves with tumults and riots, with publishing insulting pamphlets, and the like. But now they proceeded to action. The history of France is filled with the most atrocious deeds of violence which the "faithful" allowed themselves to commit on the

[1] Francis of Guise, the aged High Constable Montmorency, and the Marshal St. André. These were joined by Anthony of Bourbon.

[2] *Thuan.* l. c. xxix. 7. The edict commanded the Huguenots to restore their churches and ecclesiastical property to the Catholics; it forbade them to hold secret meetings, to levy taxes save for the clergy and the poor, to enlist soldiers, to destroy churches, crucifixes, and pictures; by which it may be inferred what course they had hitherto pursued. The Parliament refused to register this edict. Cf. *Daniel*, l. c. viii. 396. The Sorbonne also declared against it.

Digitized by Google

"Papists" and their "idolatrous worship" for more than forty years.[1] The inhuman atrocities of which they were guilty had not even the excuse of being the effect of sudden excitement; they were performed at the instigation and with the approbation of Calvinistic preachers and synods. The principal scene of devastation was southern France. Many churches were pulled down; the Catholic priests were ill-treated and driven away; pictures, relics, and in some places — as at Nismes (1561), where Viret had stirred up the passions of the populace — even the Sacred Hosts were given to the flames. Similar outbursts of a wild fanaticism took place at Paris, where (December, 1561) the Huguenots took the church of Medardus by storm, ill-treated the Catholics, and trampled underfoot the consecrated Hosts.[2] Matters were worse yet in the little kingdom of Béarn. Here the regent was Johanna d'Albret, wife of Anthony of Bourbon, who in 1563 had become a Calvinist. She deposed the Catholics from their dignities, expelled the priests, and replaced them by preachers; while, at the instance of the latter, she forbade the exercise of Catholic worship. Those of the inhabitants who resisted this command were severely punished, and the priests who refused to apostatize were cruelly murdered.[3]

Such an insult to their faith, such a profanation of all they held most sacred, exasperated the Catholics to such a degree that a lasting peace was no longer possible.[4] Shortly after the edict of

[1] Over five thousand priests and members of religious orders have suffered martyrdom during the civil and religious wars. On the numerous martyrs belonging to the Order of St. Francis, see Annales Minorum, continuat, tom. xix., xx., xxi. *P. Gaudentius*, Contributions, etc., p. 110 sqq., where the assertion that the so-called Old Orders were devoid of life and energy is disproved. Just during the terrible wars the great beneficial reform of the regular clergy in France took place.

[2] Hereupon Beza writes to Calvin, Dec. 30, 1561: "Qui hostibus armatis pepercerant, *idolis et panaceo illi Deo* parcere non potuerunt, frustra reclamantibus, quibus ista non placebant."

[3] *Poyedavant*, Hist. des troubles du Béarn, ii. 424. Pau, 1820. *Segretain*, Sixte V. et Henri IV. p. 47 sqq. Paris, 1861.

[4] Cf. *Picot*, Essai hist. sur l'influence de la réligion en France pendant le 17 siècle. In Montpellier the Huguenots destroyed forty-six churches; in Orleans, nineteen; in the kingdom of Béarn, Coligny had three hundred churches demolished. In the Dioceses Uzès, Nismes, Viviers, and Mende, five hundred churches were torn down. The magnificent cathedral at Beziers was transformed into a stable. About one hundred and fifty cathedrals and abbeys were ruined with the brutality of vandalism; the "idolatrous pictures" burnt, the sacred vessels desecrated. At Nismes the Huguenots murdered eighty Catholics of good standing, and cast their dead bodies into the "bloody springs." In Sully, Coligny had thirty-five priests made away

Digitized by Google

January the religious wars broke out in France. The event, called by Protestant writers the Massacre of Vassy, on March 1, 1562, gave the signal for a general insurrection of the Huguenots, who had long since been prepared by their preachers and synods to "defend the gospel" by an armed force. Beza had proposed the taking up of arms, and the Calvinist synods had perfectly agreed with him.[1]

At the head of the Huguenots stood the Prince of Condé, to whom Elizabeth, Queen of England, had promised assistance at the price of his surrendering Havre-de-Grace to her. But the traitor did not accomplish his purpose. The insurgents were defeated at the battle of Dreux, Dec. 19, 1562. Coligny retreated to Orleans. Duke Francis of Guise laid siege to this city, but was assassinated by Coligny's master of the horse, Poltrot de Méré, February, 1563. Catherine de Médicis then concluded the Peace of Amboise with the Prince of Condé, with which Coligny and the Huguenot preachers were not satisfied.[2]

The peace was but of short duration; for even as early as 1567 the well-organized Huguenots formed a new plot against King Charles IX., of whose person they intended to take possession in the castle of Monceaux. The king fled to Paris, whither the rebels followed him. The revolt had spread over the whole of France. The royal troops gained a splendid victory, under Montmorency, near St. Denys, in spite of which the Huguenots, supported by the Elector of the Palatinate, obtained great advantages in the Peace of Longjumeau, March 23, 1568.

As, however, the Huguenots did not relinquish their treasonable alliances with the German princes, with England, and the Netherlands, and did not evacuate the strongholds occupied by them, the king dismissed the Chancellor de l'Hospital, who favored the Huguenots, and revoked the edict of January, 1562. At this, the third religious war broke out, which was carried on with great asperity.

with and their bodies thrown into the Loire. In Pithiviers he had all the priests hanged. When Gabriel de Lorges, Count of Montgomery, had freed Béarn, in 1569, from French troops, he caused three thousand Catholics of every age, sex, and condition to be hewn down, the churches to be laid in ashes, etc. The Calvinist synod of Lescar demanded that every one should be forced to attend the Calvinist sermons. Can we wonder that by such conduct on the part of the Huguenots and their leaders, the French Catholics, who constituted the immense majority, were driven beyond all bounds? Cf. *Bossuet*, Hist. des variations, x. 52.

[1] Cf. Ép. aux églises principales du Royaume, March 25, 1562. Cf. *Aymon*, Synodes nationaux des égl. réf. de France.

[2] See *Bossuet*, l. c. x. 47.

Digitized by Google

Notwithstanding the victories of the royal army near Jarnac and Moncontour (1569),[1] the Huguenots obtained a favorable peace (1570) at St. Germain-en-Laye,[2] which not only granted them freedom of religious worship, but conceded to them four fortified cities, — La Rochelle, Cognac, Montauban, and La Charité.

The marriage[3] of Henry of Navarre with Margaret of Valois was intended to cement this peace. The personal relationships between Coligny and the royal court also assumed a more friendly aspect in 1571. The admiral made his appearance at Blois (September 18), and acquired great influence over Charles IX., which he used to induce the king to expel all the family of Guise from court and involve himself in a war with Spain. Charles IX., who had also concluded a treaty with Elizabeth of England (April 29, 1572), was now ready to send auxiliary troops to the help of the rebellious Netherlands, when the catastrophe of Aug. 24, 1572, gave a new direction to the course of things.

§ 174. *Protestantism in France (continued). — The Night of St. Bartholomew. — The League. — The Edict of Nantes. — Its Repeal under Louis XIV.*

The marriage of Henry of Navarre with the Princess Margaret took place on the 18th of August, 1572, in Paris. The nobility of the Huguenot party were present in great numbers; they came attended by an armed retinue. Coligny was also present, and made use of the occasion for urging the war with Spain. He also busied himself in sowing discord between Catherine de Médicis and her son, endeavoring to exclude the former from taking part in the affairs of government. Exasperated at this, the queen-mother sought to have

[1] The Prince of Condé fell in battle. Henry of Bourbon, Prince of Navarre, afterwards Henry IV., replaced him, together with Henry of Bourbon, Prince of Condé. Coligny commanded the troops. At the head of the Catholic troops stood Henry of Anjou, a brother of Charles IX., and Henry of Guise, son of the murdered Duke Francis.

[2] In this battle twelve thousand men lost their lives. Coligny, whom the Parliament of Paris had placed under ban, September 13, had applied for aid to England, Scotland, Denmark, Switzerland, and Germany.

[3] Pope Pius V. had altogether refused to give dispensation for this marriage. Gregory XIII. coupled conditions with the one he granted which the court did not accept. Margaret also refused her consent. On the 15th of December, 1599, this marriage was declared null and void. (*Davila*, l. c. v. 267. Collection compl. des Mémoires, xx. 148, 149.)

Digitized by Google

the admiral assassinated. Maurevert's attempt at assassination failed, and the only result was a great increase of bitterness on the side of the Huguenots. This drove Catherine to do her utmost; and together with her son, Henry of Anjou, and others, she formed the plan of having all the Huguenots assembled at Paris assassinated. Charles, who had himself been displeased at some bold and daring language used by the admiral,[1] at length yielded to the representations of his mother and gave a tardy consent. The night from the 23d to the 24th of August (St. Bartholomew's night) was fixed upon for the execution of the plan. Coligny and many distinguished Huguenots lost their lives on this night.[2] The murderous scenes were even repeated in the provinces by royal command. The number of the Huguenots murdered may be set at about two thousand.[3]

In order to justify this atrocious deed,[4] which was neither the result of long premeditation nor in any way occasioned by motives of religion,[5] the king informed the European courts that a conspiracy against his life had been discovered, which had been suppressed at its outbreak by the assassination of the conspirators. On receiving this declaration, the correctness of which even the English Court did not doubt at the time, Gregory XIII. held a feast of thanksgiving for the deliverance of the royal family from danger,

[1] Cf. *Lingard*, History of England, viii. In a conversation with Coligny the king once exclaimed: "It is not long since you were satisfied if you were but tolerated by the Catholics; now you demand equality with them; full soon you will require to be the only ones, and then you will hunt us out of the kingdom." ("Il n'y a pas longtemps que vous vous contentiez d'être soufferts par les catholiques; maintenant vous demandez à être égaux; bientôt vous voudrez être seuls et nous chasser du royaume.") (*Poyedavant*, l. c. i. 252.)

[2] *Gandy* gives important information in his article "La Saint Barthélemy," which occurs in the "Revue des questions historiques," p. 331 sqq. Paris, 1866. Cf. Civiltà cattol. (1866–1867).

[3] See *Lingard*, viii. 437.

[4] Civ. catt. l. c. xi. 649 sqq. Collection, etc. xx. 154.

[5] This is proved: (1) By the declaration of the king in Parliament (Collection, etc. xx. 160), "Le roi déclara, que rien ne s'était fait, que par ses ordres" ("The king declared that nothing had been done but by his orders"); (2) By the declaration of his envoy in London, "Le roi son maître avait été forcé à la saint Barthélemy pour l'asseurance de sa personne et de son éstat" ("The king was forced to St. Bartholomew for the safety of his person and his State"); (3) By the fact that no bishop was in the counsel of the king; (4) That the ecclesiastics, as Bishop Hennuyer of Lisieux, protected the persecuted. Likewise, (5) the Lutheran theologians Andrea and Selnecker, in their reports to the Elector Augustus of Saxony, treated the matter as a political event. (Cf. Civ. catt. l. c. xi. 656 sqq.)

Digitized by Google

and the preservation of the Catholic religion in France,[1] notwithstanding that he greatly disapproved of the manner of the royal proceedings, and. repeatedly expressed his regret at, and abhorrence of, the massacre of the Huguenots.[2]

Some time after this massacre, which the German Lutherans declared to be a just judgment of God on the Huguenots, the fourth religious war began, which ended with the peace of July, 1573, after Henry of Anjou had been elected King of Poland. Then came a split among the Catholics themselves. The Duke Francis of Alençon headed a political party which allied itself with the Huguenots. In the following year Charles IX. died; during his reign the Catholic Church had been laid under heavy contributions.

Charles left to his brother, Henry III., King of Poland, a divided and weakened kingdom. The latter did nothing to restore the welfare of France, but abandoned himself to a life of dissipation and profligacy.[3] A new war with the Huguenots brought to the Calvinists the Amnesty of 1576, or Peace of Beaulieu (Paix de Monsieur), in which were guaranteed to them freedom of religion and eight new strongholds. This peace called into existence the Catholic League, at the head of which stood the valiant Henry of Guise. There were now two organized parties in France, one of which sought help from the Protestant courts of Europe, the other from the King of Spain. Henry III., with his brother Francis, Duke of Alençon, and after 1573, of Anjou, joined the league; and at the Diet of Blois, 1577, the king declared, in accordance with the wishes of the States General, that the Catholic religion alone should be tolerated in France. The Huguenots took up arms, and on the 17th of September obtained again, by the Edict of Poitiers, a limited permission to practise their religion.

[1] Cf. *Hergenröther*, Catholic Church and Christian State, p. 654 sqq. The manner in which the matter was looked upon in Rome may be gathered from the discourse which *Muret* delivered before Gregory XIII. when the Pope gave a public audience to the French ambassador Rambouillet. He said, among other things: "Veriti non sunt [scl. Hugenotti] adv. illius regis caput ac salutem *conjurare*, a quo post tot atrocia facinora non modo veniam consecuti erant, sed etiam benigne et amanter excepti. Qua conjuratione sub id ipsum tempus, quod patrando sceleri dicatum ac constitutum erat, divinitus detecta atque patefacta, conversum est in illorum sceleratorum ac foedifragorum capita id, quod ipsi in regem et in totam prope domum ac stirpem regiam machinabantur." (Opp. Muret ed. *Ruhnkenius*, i. 177.)

[2] Cf. Brântome, Vie de M. l'Admiral de Chastillon. (Œuvres comp. tom. iii. 283. Paris, 1822.)

[3] Henry of Navarre was, in this respect, little better than the king.

Digitized by Google

New complications followed the death of Francis, Duke of Anjou, 1584. Henry III. being childless, Henry of Navarre was presumptive heir to the throne. He was acceptable neither to the queen-mother nor to the league. Henry of Guise therefore called upon the Cardinal de Bourbon[1] to make good his claim to the crown. He did this, in the manifesto of Peronne, on the 31st of March, 1585; on the 7th of July the king came to an understanding with the league, and published the Edict of Nemours, which forbade the practice of Calvinism in France, expelled the Huguenots from the kingdom, and declared them incapable of holding any office.

It was in vain that the chiefs of the league sought to obtain from Gregory XIII. a bull approving of their arrangement. Sixtus V. also refused assent to them, though he declared in a formal document, Sept. 9, 1585, that Henry of Navarre and the Prince of Condé, being formal heretics, were incapable of ascending the throne of France, by the laws that were still in force in that kingdom.

Meantime civil war still continued to rage. Henry of Navarre on the one side gained the battle of Coutras, Oct. 20, 1587. On the other, Henry of Guise, on the 20th of November, defeated the German auxiliary troops of the Huguenots. The conduct of Henry III. was vacillating and dishonest. At first he entered into treaty with Henry of Navarre; then he joined the league, and at the Reunion's Edict of Rouen (July 19, 1588) denied the right of succession to a Protestant prince.

The murder of Henry of Guise and of his brother Louis, committed by royal mandate, clearly showed the real sentiments of Henry III. towards the league, at whose head now stood Charles of Mayenne, a brother of the murdered princes, who had himself escaped the assassin's dagger. Consequently the league renounced allegiance to the king. Henry III. then united with the Huguenots, and together with Henry of Navarre laid siege to Paris; here, on Aug. 1, 1589, he was assassinated by the Dominican James Clement.

The contest now presented another phase. Henry of Navarre assumed the royal title, while the league proclaimed the Cardinal de Bourbon king, as Charles X. (+ May 8, 1590). The civil war continued. Henry conquered the army of the league at Arques and Ivry, but found it necessary to become a Catholic in order to secure permanent tranquillity. Consequently (July 26, 1593) he made public profession of the Catholic belief in St. Denys; he was crowned

[1] He was uncle to Henry of Navarre.

Digitized by Google

king on the 27th of February, 1594, but not absolved from excommunication till the year 1595. After this the league submitted.

Although the unity of France had been in this way re-established, interior peace was by no means restored. The Huguenots repeatedly revolted, and even the Edict of Nantes[1] (April 13, 1598) failed to pacify them. Under Louis XIII. (1610–1643) religious wars again broke forth.[2] The Peace of Montpellier (1622) restored peace for a time only; it was not till the capture of La Rochelle, 1628, that the Huguenots found themselves compelled to submit. The king's minister, the Cardinal Richelieu, then deprived them of their political privileges and of their strongholds. The other articles of the Edict of Nantes still remained in force.

Meanwhile the French clergy had displayed an unwonted energy and activity in endeavoring to bring back the wandering sheep to the fold of the Church. Under the reign of Louis XIV. (1643–1715) multitudes of the Huguenots were converted. The court countenanced and encouraged the mission work, which caused new seditions on the part of the sectaries. These seditions, being suppressed by force, caused the abridgment of their privileges until, acting upon the advice of his chancellor, Le Tellier, the king finally revoked the Edict of Nantes, Oct. 18, 1685.

The conduct of Louis XIV. and of his minister, Louvois, by which, notwithstanding the disapproval of the Pope,[3] they thought to convert these subjects by exterior force, occasioned several rebellions in Cevennes. Fanatics of the school of the prophet Duserres, in Dauphiny, inflamed the Calvinists (Camisardes) of that region to acts of the greatest cruelty. They were finally, though with difficulty, suppressed by the royal troops.

After the death of Louis XIV. the laws against the Huguenots

[1] The Edict of Nantes stipulated, for instance, "that the Catholic religion should be again exercised in places where it had been suppressed." But neither in Béarn nor in any place where the Huguenots felt themselves to be in security, did they allow Catholics the free exercise of their religion. (*Picot*, l. c. p. 35.)

[2] The Huguenots formed a politico-religious party which, in their provincial conventions and synods, negotiated concerning peace and war, concluded treaties with foreign courts, especially with England (1625, 1627, and 1659), and took advantage of every embarrassment in which the court found itself, to extort greater concessions from the king. (Cf. *Picot*, l. c. 426 sqq.)

[3] Pope Innocent XI., who at that time was not on very good terms with Louis XIV., requested King James II., through D' Adda, his nuncio in London, to intercede with Louis XIV. and prevail on him to adopt a more lenient treatment towards the Huguenots. (*Mazure*, Hist. de la révolution de 1688, tom. ii. 126. Paris, 1825.)

Digitized by Google

remained indeed on the statute-book, but they were never put into execution. In November, 1787, Louis XVI. allowed them the same rights as other citizens.

The hostile position taken by the Huguenots towards the Catholic Church is evident from the rancorous expressions of hatred made use of at their national synods, regarding the teaching, the usages, and the institutions of the Church. The synods which thus assailed the Catholic Church were held after the Edict of Nantes, — that is, after the restoration of peace. Cf. *Aymon*, i. p. 140, pp. 83, 84, 142, 219.

§ 175. *Protestantism in the Netherlands.*

Protestantism was smuggled into the Netherlands[1] by the prophets from Zwickau and by merchants; but it found few adherents, and against these few Charles V. took strong measures. But so much the greater progress did the heresy make under Philip II.; while the lower nobility (who for the most part were deep in debt), and some ambitious men in power, used the occasion as a means to free the country from the crown of Spain. At the head of those who, under the pretext of religion, sought this political severance was the impious and faithless prince William of Orange, who endeavored to decry all the measures of the king as encroachments on the liberties and privileges of the people. The discontent thus called forth was increased by the new division of dioceses,[2] — a proceeding justified by the necessity which occasioned it, also by the carrying into effect of the edicts against heretics; and other causes may have contributed to it. This discontent was chiefly manifested at this time by calumniating and vilifying the able and conscientious Cardinal Granvella, Prime Minister to Margaret, Duchess of Parma, who administered the government for the King of Spain.

The first attempt at revolt succeeded. The Spanish troops quitted the Netherlands, Granvella resigned in 1564, and the party of the nobility came into power.

William of Orange proceeded yet further in the path of rebellion; he strove to stir up the people by the spread of false rumors, such,

[1] *Stradae Romani* (S. J.), Hist. Belgicae duae decades. 2 vols. Rom. 1640 sqq.

[2] In the Netherlands there were four bishoprics, — Utrecht, Arras, Cambray, and Tournay. At the request of the king, Pope Paul IV., 1559, by the bull "Super universas orbis," raised Malines, Cambray, and Utrecht to the dignity of archbishoprics, and established fourteen new bishoprics. (Bull. Rom. vi. 559 sqq.)

Digitized by Google

for instance, as that the king intended to introduce the Spanish Inquisition into the Netherlands. Thus he effected, in 1565, the so-called compromise, — an alliance of Protestant and Catholic members of the nobility, — the professed object of which was to keep watch over the rights and privileges of the country. The Government took no decisive measures against these rebellious nobles, who, aided and countenanced by the Protestants in France and Germany, became bolder and bolder in their demands. At the head of the malcontents, besides William of Orange, were the Counts of Egmont and Hoorne.

The rebellion broke forth in 1566. The members of the compromise sent, by the hands of two hundred and fifty nobles (Gueux, beggars), a petition to the stadtholder (or regent) Margaret, demanding the suspension of the edicts of religion and the convocation of the States General, which demands they intended to extort by force.

Meantime many Calvinistic preachers had come to the Netherlands under the protection of the Gueux, who, with the help of the people, plundered churches and cloisters, broke up or burnt pictures and sacred vessels, trod the Blessed Sacrament underfoot, and perpetrated many other outrages, which opened the eyes of such Catholics as had been led astray. They joined the Government party, which then defeated the rebels. William of Orange fled to Germany, and Count Egmont returned to his allegiance to the king.

Instead of coming in person into the Netherlands, Philip II. sent the Duke of Alva, whom he invested with great powers, and placed at the head of a large army; on this Margaret laid down her office. William of Orange, who had calumniated the king in several pamphlets, raised troops with the help of the Protestant princes, and began the war against Alva. Alva dispersed the rebels, but by establishing a "council concerning the disturbances," by commanding the execution of the Counts of Egmont and Hoorne, and especially by the exaction of new and very oppressive taxes, he excited general dissatisfaction, which was heightened by the plundering carried on by the Spanish troops. War broke out anew, which raged especially in the northern provinces.

Neither Alva nor his successor, Don Luis de Requesens, succeeded in putting down the rebellion. The intriguing William of Orange frustrated all conciliatory designs; for which purpose he chiefly used Calvinism as a weapon against Spain.

After the death of Luis de Requesens (+ 1576), Don John of

Digitized by Google

Austria, the illustrious hero of Lepanto, succeeded him as stadtholder. Filled with the desire to restore tranquillity to the country, he tried most zealously to promote peace and order by several concessions; but his efforts were met with ingratitude, and he was at length obliged to draw the sword against the rebels. He vanquished them, but, being deserted by Spain, could not follow up his victory, and died of grief, Oct. 1, 1578.

Under his successor, Alexander of Parma, the southern provinces submitted to the king by the Treaty of Arras, while the northern provinces (Holland), led by William of Orange, entered into an alliance for mutual assistance by the Union of Utrecht, 1579; and when in 1581 Brabant, Flanders, and Mechlin had joined the union, the alliance formally renounced allegiance to the king.

After the death of William, in 1584, the war was continued. Maurice of Orange assumed his father's position. In the year 1609 a truce was concluded, in which the independence of the northern provinces was recognized.

In 1582 William, in violation of the solemn declarations he had repeatedly made, proscribed in Holland the public exercise of the Catholic religion. In the other provinces which had torn themselves loose from Spain the same thing was done; notwithstanding which a considerable number of Catholics there remained faithful to their creed.

§ 176. *Apostasy of England from the Church.*

A sinful love brought Henry VIII. of England[1] into opposition to the Church, which a short time previously he had defended against Luther.[2] He wished for the dissolution of his marriage with Catherine of Aragon, the widow of his brother Arthur, that he might be free to marry Anne Boleyn. Pope Clement VII. at first commissioned Cardinal Wolsey, Henry's minister, and Cardinal

[1] Vera et sincera historia schismatis Anglicani, de ejus origine et progressu a *N. Sandero*, aucta et castigatius edita a *R. P. Ribadeneira.* Colon, 1628. *Lingard*, History of England, vol. vi. sqq. *Dodd*, Church History of England, edited anew by *Tierney*. 5 vols. London, 1839 sqq. *Blunt*, The Reformation of the Church of England. 2 vols. London, 1869 and 1882. *Burnet*, History of the Reformation of the Church of England. *Cobbett*, History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland. *Challoner*, Memoirs, etc. Other works are mentioned in *Dublin Review*, 1877, p. 426 sqq.

[2] Henry wrote "Assertio septem sacramentorum adv. Luth."

Digitized by Google

Campeggio,[1] the papal legate, to examine the question, and at a later date (July 19, 1529), summoned the affair before his own court; but he could not grant the king's desire, so repeatedly expressed, and in favor of which he (Henry) had obtained the decisions of several universities. This just refusal of the Pope to grant the king's demand irritated Henry VIII. to that degree that he, by the advice of Thomas Cromwell, declared himself to be the supreme head of the English Catholics, and compelled the clergy to acknowledge him as the Supreme Head of the Church in England "in so far as allowed by the law of God." Soon after this, Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, died; and the king promoted to his place the servile and unworthy flatterer Thomas Cranmer, who pronounced Henry's marriage with Catherine invalid, and the one which the king had already contracted with Anne Boleyn (Jan. 25, 1533) to be lawful, and the children of the marriage to be capable of inheriting the crown. The Pope cancelled this decision March 23, 1534, and this act brought about the complete rupture of the king with Rome. Cromwell became Royal Vicar-General in 1535.

The servile Parliament willingly met the wishes of the king. It decreed the abolition of annates (first-fruits), 1532, prohibited the transmission of money to Rome, and appeals thereto; reserved the right of confirming the election of bishops to the king; and enacted the statute of succession, as well as that of taking the oath of supremacy. Whoever refused to acknowledge this supremacy and to take this oath was severely punished. The distinguished cardinal John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and the celebrated and learned Thomas More, with others, were condemned to the scaffold (1535).

In order to get money, the king proceeded to suppress the monasteries. The Franciscans had already excited the hatred of the king by defending the lawful marriage with Catherine. Many of them were imprisoned and martyred. By a bill of the 4th of March, 1536, the smaller communities were dissolved, on the plea of declining discipline; and after the failure of the insurrection of the "Pilgrims," the larger convents were suppressed, and their property confiscated to the king, yet the larger portion of it was practically appropriated by the visitors appointed to examine into the derelictions of religious houses. By the year 1540 the work of spoliation was complete. It brought, after all, but little profit to the crown,

[1] Cf. *Laemmer*, Mon. Vatic. p. 25 sqq.

Digitized by Google

while the want and misery of the poor were thereby greatly increased.[1]

The repudiated Queen Catherine died in 1536. Anne Boleyn, charged with various crimes, was beheaded the same year. Cranmer now declared that Henry's marriage with Anne had always been null and void. The hope that Henry would become reconciled to the Church died out; but, on the other hand, Luther could not win over the king to his party.

Irritated at the excommunication pronounced upon him by Paul III., Henry ordered the Church pictures, images, and relics to be burnt; and he committed other atrocities,[2] at the same time that he adhered to the main points of Catholic dogma, and commanded, under pain of death, the observance of the six articles sometimes called "the bloody articles." These enforced belief in transubstantiation, Communion under one species, celibacy of the clergy, vows, Masses for the dead, and auricular confession. Cranmer, who had married secretly Osiander's niece, sent her and her children back to Germany as quickly as possible.[3]

Catholics and Lutherans were persecuted alike; the former were condemned to death for high-treason,[4] the latter for heresy. The proceedings against heretics were conducted by Cranmer, who held the same views himself for which he at that time condemned men to death by fire, — views which, after Henry's death, he professed and defended.

"Henry reigned for thirty-eight years; and during that time he ordered the execution of two queens, two cardinals, two archbishops, eighteen bishops, thirteen abbots, five hundred priors and monks, thirty-eight doctors of divinity and laws, twelve dukes and earls, one hundred and sixty-four gentlemen, one hundred and twenty-four commoners, and one hundred and ten ladies of rank."[5] The tyrant died in the year 1547.

[1] On the suppression of monasteries, see, besides Lingard and Cobbet, La conversion de l'Angleterre au christianisme comparée avec sa prétendue réforme: traduite par Niceron, p. 268 sqq. Paris, 1729, *Spelman*, History and Fate of Sacrilege, etc. London, 1698 and 1846.

[2] The king ordered St. Thomas à Becket to be arraigned, and condemned as guilty of high-treason. He had his bones dug up and burnt to ashes.

[3] Bible-reading was confined to the king and the higher classes, and Tyndale's false translation forbidden.

[4] Even near relatives of the king, such as the mother and brothers of Cardinal Pole, were put to death. The cardinal himself was in safety on the Continent. Cf. *Morris*, The Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers, related by themselves. Lond. 1872.

[5] Alzog's History.

Digitized by Google

Edward VI., a boy nine years of age, then became supreme head of the English Church. His uncle, Lord Seymour, under the title of Duke of Somerset, held the reins of government as protector of the realm; and Cranmer afforded him all possible aid in the introduction of Protestantism. Parliament struck out the six above-named articles from the statute-book, withdrew the right of electing bishops from the chapters, and assigned to the crown a considerable part of Church property. Marriage was now also permitted to the clergy. Cranmer composed a book of homilies, the use of which was made obligatory on the clergy. Recusant clergy were driven from their livings. Bishop Gardiner of Winchester was imprisoned for the resistance he showed. In order to complete the victory of the so-called Reformation, the Parliament in 1549 passed a law making the use of the liturgy [1] composed by the primate "under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost" obligatory on all ministers. By this measure the holy sacrifice of the Mass was abolished, and Communion under both kinds introduced; and thus "the Church by law established" was made ready.

Neither the risings of the English people nor the fall of Somerset through Warwick, then Duke of Northumberland, had brought relief to the Catholics. The faithless primate made common cause with the new regent, at whose command (1552) he, in conjunction with Ridley, Bishop of London, drew up a formula of belief in forty-two articles.[2] The liturgy was revised, freed from all "papistical" remnants, and introduced in 1552 by the Parliament by main force. The primate also had a collection of ecclesiastical laws [3] made, among which belief in transubstantiation and in the supremacy of the Pope

[1] Book of Common Prayer. Whosoever worshipped after any other fashion was punished. (*Lingard.*) As assistants, Cranmer summoned to Oxford, 1547, Peter Martyr Vermilio (born at Florence, 1500, he entered the order of Augustinian Monks; in 1542 he fled to Zurich, and apostatized) and Ochino (§ 187). He invited to Cambridge Bucer (§ 168) and Paul Fagius from Strasburg.

[2] *Burnet*, History of the Reformation, ii. 209 sqq. All who took the Doctor's degree had to swear to them. In the oath the following passage occurs: "Deo teste promitto ac spondeo, me scripturae auctoritatem hominum judiciis praepositurum . . . et articulos . . . regia auctoritate in lucem editos pro veris et certis habiturum et omni in loco tanquam consentientes cum verbo Dei defensurum." (*Lingard*, vii. 106.)

[3] Cf. Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum. London, 1640. Calvin wrote to the Protector Somerset that he should destroy by the sword all such as should resist the new church establishment, especially the Catholics ("gens obstinés aux superstitions de l'Antechrist de Rome"). See *Henry*, Life of Calvin, ii. Appendix, p. 30 (Joh. Calv. Ep. Geneva, 1576, p. 67).

Digitized by Google

was threatened with death. It was fortunate for the Catholics that Edward VI. died in 1553, before these laws were published.

A party headed by the Duke of Northumberland, who thought to secure the succession to the throne in his own family, conspired to deprive the Catholic Queen Mary of the crown, and to substitute the Lady Jane Grey; but these rebels were vanquished, and their leaders beheaded. The chief anxiety of the queen, who gave her hand in marriage to Philip II. of Spain, was the reconciliation of England with the Holy See. This took place on the 28th of November, 1554. Cardinal Reginald Pole,[1] as papal legate, received England again into the communion of the Church. The possessors of the property which had been stolen from the Church were not molested in their ill-gotten goods and lands; but those possessions which had been confiscated to the crown were all restored to the Church. Cardinal Pole (+ 1558) became Archbishop of Canterbury.

Unfortunately, the conspiracies of Wyatt, Suffolk, and others, together with the invectives hurled by Protestant preachers on the queen,[2] compelled the latter to take more stringent measures against the heretics. About two hundred persons — some of whom, however, were convicted of high-treason, as were Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Bishop of Worcester — were executed. After a short reign Mary died (Nov. 15, 1558), and was succeeded by her sister Elizabeth, who was a Protestant by birth, although during the last reign she had publicly professed Catholicity.

Elizabeth was crowned after the Catholic rite, and thereby compelled to take the oath that she would uphold the Catholic faith. Nevertheless, being regarded as illegitimate by her Catholic subjects, and receiving from Pope Paul IV. an answer that offended her, while it held her claim to the throne as doubtful, she soon after her ascension declared in favor of Protestantism, and took measures against the Catholics. The religious indifferentism[3] of those in the higher ranks favored her policy. With a majority of three votes Parliament renewed in 1559 the laws of Henry VIII. and of Edward VI. against the Church, and by the Act of Uniformity (June, 1559) prescribed Cranmer's liturgy,[4] and commanded

[1] Epistolarum Reginaldi Poli, etc. ed. *Quirini* (Card. et episc.). 5 vols. Brixiae, 1744. This edition also contains a history of the life of the cardinal, composed by his secretary, *Beccadello* (Latin in the first volume, Italian in the fifth volume).

[2] Ridley, Bishop of London, preached in public against the queen.

[3] *Bentivoglio*, Relazioni, p. 174. *Lee*, The Church under Queen Elizabeth.

[4] *Lingard*, vii. 296.

Digitized by Google

the exacting of the oath of supremacy. The members of the two universities and the higher clergy, especially the bishops, save one, resisted. Such as persisted in their refusal lost their places. Matthew Parker, formerly chaplain to Anne Boleyn, was appointed Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury. He ordained the other bishops. In the year 1562 the oath of supremacy was extended to the members of the lower house of Parliament (the Commons), to public teachers, to lawyers, to the whole clergy, etc. The convocation of clergy in the following year reduced the *forty-two* articles to *thirty-nine.*

The Anglican Church differed from every other Protestant sect in recognizing a hierarchy of three orders of clergy. The ancient ecclesiastical ritual, as contained in the Catholic missal, in the matin office, and in vespers, was, with some alterations, retained. The ordinal of Edward VI. was recognized as the authorized ceremonial in the consecration of bishops and in the ordination of priests and deacons. The Established Church encountered opposition from the so-called Nonconformists, who were harshly persecuted; but under this head it was the Catholics[1] rather than the Puritans[2] who were aimed at, though these latter denied the royal supremacy, the superiority of the bishops over the presbytery, and the like. The examination for religious delinquencies was carried on by the Court of the High Commission, — a terrible tribunal of inquisition, which was not bound to follow the ordinary forms of judicial inquiry.

The attempt to liberate the unfortunate Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, from the hands of Elizabeth,[3] with whom she had sought hospitality; and the publication of the bull "Regnans in excelsis," of February, 1570, by which Pius V. excommunicated Elizabeth,[4] — rendered the condition of the English Catholics still more unbearable. Parliament prohibited, under heavy penalties, every communication with Rome by English Catholics, and also, under penalty of punishment for disobedience, commanded every subject to be present at the Protestant service. In the year 1581 the criminal edicts

[1] *Lingard,* vii., viii.

[2] *Lingard,* viii. 134 sqq. *Neal,* History of the Puritans. Halle, 1754. The Independents, or Congregationalists, — also called Brownists, from their founder, Robert Brown, — went farther yet, and established their church on the broadest democratic basis.

[3] See § 177.

[4] Bullar, Rom. (Taurin. 1862), vii. 810 sqq. Compare *Hergenröther,* Catholic Church, etc., p. 678 sqq., in which the absurd calumny that the Pope had hired assassins to kill Elizabeth is thoroughly refuted.

Digitized by Google

became more and more severe, and were more especially directed against the priesthood, so that any exercise of priestly function was punished with death. After the death of Thomas Watson, Bishop of Lincoln (+ 1584), the Catholic hierarchy became extinct. Gregory XV. appointed a Vicar-Apostolic in 1623.

In order to provide for the education of Catholic priests for England, William Allen in 1568 established a seminary at Douay in Flanders, which at a later period was transferred to Rheims,[1] but reopened at Douay in 1593. Pope Gregory XIII. in 1579 also founded the English Seminary in Rome. This increased the already vehement severity of the English Government against the Catholic priests.[2] Spies ("agens provocateurs") were employed to lay snares for the Catholics, for the purpose of denouncing them as traitors; notwithstanding which they gave many proofs of their loyalty to the inhuman queen, especially when in the year 1588 Philip threatened the shores of England with the invincible Armada, in retaliation for the alliance which Elizabeth had formed with his rebellious subjects of the Netherlands. Their reward for this was in new and cruel persecutions,[3] which did not cease even after the death of the tyrannic woman.

Elizabeth was the last scion of the house of Tudor. She was succeeded by James VI., King of Scotland, a son of Mary Stuart. He ascended the throne of Great Britain under the name of James I.

[1] See Records of the English Catholics under the Penal Law, vols. i., ii. *Bellesheim*, Cardinal W. Allen and the English Seminaries on the Continent. Mentz.

[2] *Lingard*, viii. 142 sqq. Whoever gave shelter to a Jesuit, or refused to betray his place of refuge, was put to death. Hearing confessions was adjudged to be high-treason, and was punished as such. Celebrating and assisting at Mass subjected the offender to fine and imprisonment. In the year 1584 it was enacted that all English priests who did not leave the land within forty days, and all who sheltered them after that time, should undergo the penalty of high-treason. *Foley*, S. J., Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus. London, 1877. *Mrs. Hope*, Franciscan Martyrs in England. Annal. Minor. tom. xix. sqq. The first Jesuits came to England in 1580.

[3] Respecting the executions under Elizabeth, cf. *Challoner's* Memoirs of the Missionary Priests, and his British Martyrology, with *Lingard*, viii. 437. They describe the fearful tortures of the rack and instruments of martyrdom. Even before the year 1588, twelve hundred Catholics had lost life, property, or liberty; and yet it was after that period that persecution proper may be said to have broken out. In the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign, one hundred and forty-two priests were put to death, ninety died in prison, while sixty-two distinguished laymen underwent martyrdom. The persecution raged still more furiously in Ireland (see § 179). As to the moral condition of Elizabeth's court, see *Lingard*, viii.

Digitized by Google

Matthew Parker, appointed Archbishop of Canterbury by Elizabeth, was consecrated by four Protestant bishops, — Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, — because the Catholic bishops refused to perform the consecration. The actual consecrator was Barlow, who under Henry VIII. had been Bishop of St. Davids, and under Edward VI. Bishop of Bath. After the accession of Mary, he had fled from England; under Elizabeth he returned, and was in 1559 nominated Bishop of Chichester.

The Anglican ordinations are considered invalid. Cardinal Pole so judged them, and he was certainly well acquainted with the state of things. He declared all the orders conferred under Edward VI. null and void. Consistently with this view, all the English clergymen who are converted to the faith are re-ordained if they desire to become priests.

The reasons for considering Parker's consecration to be invalid, and consequently that all orders conferred by him are null and void, are principally these: (1) It is not proved that Barlow himself was really and validly consecrated bishop; (2) His character and his doctrine render it doubtful whether he had the right intention in consecrating; (3) The formula of consecration was so essentially changed under Edward VI. that, at a convocation of the clergy in the year 1662, it was thought necessary to rechange the formula.

The efforts of the learned Anglicans, which are so worthy of recognition, have failed to establish proof of the real and valid consecration of Barlow and Parker. Consult, on this whole question, the valuable treatise, Claims of a Protestant Episcopal Bishop to Apostolic Succession and Valid Orders disproved, by *S. V. Ryan*, Bishop of Buffalo. *Raynald*, O. Sct. B., The Ordinal of King Edward VI.; its History, Theology, and Liturgy. London, 1871. Cf. Dublin Review, new series, No. 41, July, 1873, p. 191 sqq. *Estcourt*, The Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed. *Per contra:* For the validity of the Anglican ordinations, see *Lee*, The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England. London, 1869. Cf. Tablet, vol. xxxiv. n. 1543; vol. xl. n. 1688 and 1689; and especially *Bailey*, Ordinum sacrorum in eccl. Anglic. defensio . . . London, 1870.

§ 177. *The so-called Reformation in Scotland.*

The undue influence exercised by the crown and the nobility in the filling up of ecclesiastical benefices led in Scotland[1] to a grievous decline in morals among the clergy, and to gross ignorance among the people. This rendered it possible for the innovators, under the appearance of zeal for religion and morals, to vilify the Catholic Church and to deride her rites and ceremonies. The first preacher of heresy, Patrick Hamilton (+ 1528), Abbot of Ferne, with others,

[1] *Lingard*, History of England, vii. 305 sqq. *James Walsh*, History of the Catholic Church in Scotland from the Introduction of Christianity to the Present Time. Glasgow, 1874. *Bellesheim*, History of the Catholic Church in Scotland.

Digitized by Google

died indeed at the stake; but the new doctrine found willing hearers among such of the nobles as were longing to lay hands on the temporal goods of the Church. After the death of James V. (+ 1542), the Government, under the regency of the Earl of Arran, favored the apostates, which induced the Cardinal David Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews, to proceed all the more vigorously against them. After his murder (May 29, 1546),[1] by a mob headed by Norman Leslie, the adherents of the new heresy, led by the furious John Knox and countenanced by Henry VIII. of England, opened the contest against Church and crown. They were defeated, yet did not renounce their opposition. In the year 1557 the Protestant lords formed the "Congregation of the Lord," in opposition to the "Congregation of Satan;" and, driven to fanaticism by John Knox, who had spent some years in Geneva, and was in 1559 recalled to Scotland, they renewed the civil wars, which the Regent Mary of Guise thought to put an end to by the treaty of 1559. This treaty insured to Protestants the free exercise of their religion. But they were not content with this; they wanted the suppression of "idolatrous worship," to effect which they tore down Catholic churches and monasteries, and ill-treated the priests and monks. The contest broke out anew. The rebels were aided by Elizabeth of England, but were not able to attain the mastery. After the death of the Regent Mary of Guise, her daughter, Mary Stuart,[2] who was married to Francis II. of France, entered into negotiations with the rebels. Her plenipotentiaries concluded the Peace of Edinburgh with the Congregation. This peace left to the queen simply the name of royalty; the real power was placed in the hands of the restless nobility. This decided the victory of the so-called Reformation.

In 1560 the Parliament declared the Catholic religion abolished, and adopted a Calvinistic confession of faith. Knox then, by his discipline-book, organized the constitution of the Church after the Calvinistic model. All remnants of papacy were destroyed, churches and monasteries were sacked with the fury of vandals, valuable libraries were burnt, and the sacred vessels desecrated and broken up. Attending Mass was forbidden under heavy penalties.

[1] His successor was John Hamilton, the last archbishop of St. Andrews (1547–1570), who had two catechisms edited. The larger, usually called "The Catechism of John Hamilton," was republished in 1884; a copy of the smaller one was found a few years ago by Rev. Geo. Griffin.

[2] *Hosak*, Mary Queen of Scots and her Accusers. 2 vols. Edinburgh and London, 1870 sqq. *Morris* (S. J.), The Letter-books of Sir Amias Poulet, Keeper of Mary Queen of Scots. London, 1874. Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI. Ed. by *W. Forbes-Leith*, S. J.

Digitized by Google

When Mary Stuart returned to Scotland in 1561, she found a disloyal nobility and a fanatic people. The concessions she made did not satisfy the ecclesiastico-political demagogues. The reformed preachers vociferated against "idolatrous worship," reviled the queen, and were not willing to suffer Mass to be said in the chapel of Edinburgh Castle. The insolent and hypocritical Knox, who personally insulted the queen, was the chief antagonist of the Catholic Church. After that, when Lord Darnley, the queen's second husband, had been murdered by a band of conspirators, whose leader is said to have been Bothwell, Knox brought the charge of adultery and murder against the unfortunate queen, who, deserted by her adherents and persecuted by her rebellious subjects, sought refuge in England, where after an imprisonment of twenty years she was beheaded by order of Queen Elizabeth, 1587.

During the minority of her son, James VI., the republican system of Church government as devised by the Puritans became predominant; and the attempt of the king, in after years, to introduce the episcopal hierarchy only gave rise to new revolts, which compelled him to abandon his plan and content himself with mere titular bishops.[1]

After James had received the English crown also, he reverted to his former plan, and in the year 1610 had thirteen bishops ordained for Scotland. At the price of a persecution of the Catholics,[2] Parliament yielded to his wishes; but so strong was the aversion of the Puritans to the Episcopal Church that the attempt of Charles I. to introduce her constitution and liturgy into Scotland created an uproar, which lent powerful assistance to the other causes which cost that monarch his throne alike with his life.

§ 178. *The Catholic Church in Great Britain under the Stuarts.*

James I.[3] was from policy devoted to the English Church, and from taste averse to the Presbyterian Puritans; yet he allowed the

[1] Knox died in 1572. His successor was A. Melville. The Convention of the Clergy at Leith, 1572, agreed to retain the titles of archbishop, bishop, etc.; but the General Assembly at Perth, 1572, protested against it, while another in 1581 commanded the bishops to lay down their office. Parliament, indeed, in 1584 confirmed the authority of the bishops; but in 1592 the Presbyterian constitution of the Church was legally acknowledged.

[2] *Gordon*, The Catholic Church in Scotland, from the Suppression of the Hierarchy (1603) to the Present Time. Aberdeen, 1874.

[3] *Lingard*, History of England. *Morris*, Condition of Catholics under James I.

Digitized by Google

laws against the recusants (those who refused to attend Protestant worship) to be carried out with great severity, though chiefly against the Catholics.[1] Their condition became even more oppressive after the discovery of the famous gunpowder plot.[2] A new penal code augmented the penalties[3] against Catholics, and the oath of allegiance which was imposed on them[4] subjected them to the arbitrary caprice of the king; yet when James, in the year 1616, somewhat alleviated the severity of their lot, Parliament and the Anglican clergy protested against his doing so.

During the reign of Charles I., who had married Henrietta of

London, 1872. Documents are in *Butler*, Hist. Memoirs, etc. 4 vols. London, 1822.

[1] At first he suspended the laws, but afterwards broke his princely word, and not only had the tax of twenty pounds per month levied, but demanded the back pay of forfeiture for thirteen months. The money was distributed among the Scottish favorites.

[2] *Lingard*, ii. The memoirs of the Jesuit Gerard contain very interesting information concerning the gunpowder plot, in which they sought to implicate Catholics. Gerard was a companion of the innocently tortured and executed Jesuit Garnet. See *Morris*, Memoirs of a Jesuit. In remembrance of the discovery of this conspiracy, a feast is yearly celebrated on the 5th of November in London and throughout England, and a prayer was inserted in the liturgy for protection against "malignant and bloodthirsty enemies." *Daniel*, Cod. liturg. iii. 555.

[3] *Lingard*. Catholics, among other disqualifications, could not be judges, physicians, or lawyers; could not be executors of a will or testament; were obliged to be married before a Protestant minister. Every recusant was considered excommunicated. Instead of the monthly fine, the king might appropriate the whole of the movable and two thirds of the immovable property. Whoever kept Catholic servants had to pay ten pounds monthly.

[4] See *Lingard*, ix. 81 sqq. *Hergenröther*, Catholic Church and Christian State, p. 686 sqq. Pope Paul V. forbade the taking of this oath (Sept. 1, 1606, and Sept. 22, 1607), "because it contained several things contrary to faith and to the welfare of souls." And such was the case; for, in the first place, the oath was but a veiled oath of supremacy; and, secondly, it condemned as *impious* and *heretical* the opinion asserted by many respected theologians, that in certain cases, especially in punishment of heresy, the Church had the power to depose sovereigns. According to the statement of De Brèves, the French envoy at Rome, King James declared himself ready to recognize the Pope as "the first bishop and Head of the Church," if he (the Pope) would renounce the assertion that the Pope could depose kings; on which Paul V. had replied that he could not do this without incurring the stain of heresy ("sans être taché d'hérésie"). (Notices et extraits des Mss. de la bibliothèque nationale, vii. 310 sqq. Paris, 1804.) It is, however, improbable that James I., who at the beginning of his reign had said, "I make what I please law and gospel," ever entertained such a project. In fact, had he willed to do it, he had no power to carry it out. (See, on this matter, *Hergenröther*, new edition, p. 481 sqq.)

Digitized by Google

France, the theory of the sovereignty of the people was supplanting that of the absolute power of the monarch. The patriots of England, and the Puritans, or "Saints," were vociferous in advocating "civil liberty," while the Episcopalian clergy preached passive obedience. The Parliament, in which the Puritans possessed the predominant power, assumed an attitude of opposition to the crown and to the Catholic Church (No Popery). The king sacrificed the Catholics [1] to the hatred of the Puritans, without being able thereby to silence their clamors; after which, from the year 1629, he sought to govern the country without a parliament at all.[2] His ecclesiastical measures in Scotland at last brought affairs to a crisis, which resulted in the inevitable catastrophe. The Scotch denounced the English liturgy, introduced in the year 1636, as the worship of Baal. In 1638 they entered into a national covenant, and in 1639 took up arms against the king. In order to obtain the means of carrying on the war, Charles summoned the "Long Parliament," 1640–1649; the majority of the members of which aimed directly at revolution.[3] Civil war began in the year 1642. In the army of the king were the nobility and the cavaliers; his opponents were joined by the Roundheads, who were made up from the fanatical classes of the people. To excite the people still more, the rebels, who in 1643 had allied themselves with the malcontents in Scotland, spread a false rumor of a papal conspiracy against Protestants. After the unfortunate battle of Naseby (1645), Charles fled to Scotland; but as he did not listen to the proposals made to him by the Scotch to adopt Presbyterianism, he was by them surrendered as a prisoner to the English Parliament. Here the Independents, guided by Oliver Cromwell, the general-in-chief of the Presbyterian army, had the upper hand. The king was conducted to prison at Holmby, and in August, 1647, transferred to Hampton Court. Thence, after escaping and being recaptured, he was removed first to the palace of St. James and thence to Whitehall, where, after undergoing a trial by the "Rump Parliament," which Cromwell had purified and which was governed by him, Charles was sentenced to death; which sentence was carried into execution on Jan. 30, 1649.

[1] *Lingard*, ix. 291. The Court and Times of Charles I. 2 vols. London, 1848.

[2] The advisers of the king, after the murder of the Duke of Buckingham, were Lord Strafford, whom Charles betrayed to death on the scaffold, and Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury.

[3] The causes of discontent were, among other things, the severity of the Star Chamber, — the highest judicial court established by Henry VII., — the proceedings of the High Commission Court (§ 176), and the ship-money.

Digitized by Google

Under the Lord Protector Cromwell, who had dispersed the Parliament and placed himself at the head of the English Republic, all sects were tolerated, and even the members of the Episcopal Church were treated with indulgence ; Catholics alone were persecuted.

Even after the restoration of the royal dignity, and also of the Established Church, under Charles II., Catholics were exposed to the hatred and persecution of English fanaticism. The Corporation Act of 1661 excluded all non-conformists from the magistracy and from the corporations. The attempts of the king to better their condition signally failed; and the return of his brother James, the Duke of York, to the Catholic communion increased the fury of the sectaries, who then laid the blame of the Great Fire of London (1666) on the Catholics. Puritans and Episcopalians made common cause. The king was obliged to withdraw his Declaration of Indulgence in 1671, and by the Test Act[1] it was made impossible for Catholics to hold any office of public trust. The lie of a "Popish Plot,"[2] invented by Titus Oates, found belief among high and low, and increased the fury of the unreasoning rabble. Lord Stafford and six Jesuits were executed as participators in this pretended conspiracy, and many Catholics were cast into prison. Attempts made by the House of Commons to exclude James, Duke of York, from the succession to the throne, were frustrated by the House of Lords.

On the death of Charles, 1685, the Duke of York was recognized as King James II. The Duke of Monmouth's attempt at revolt was suppressed at the battle of Sedgemoor; but the fears of the adherents of the High Church party were excited by the proclamation of freedom of conscience, and they were still more alarmed when James granted freedom of worship to the non-conformists, dispensed Catholics from taking the test oaths, declared them capable of holding office, and wished to abolish the disgraceful laws of the previous rulers against Catholics and Dissenters. Anglican preachers uttered warnings against the seductions to popery, and seven bishops refused to have the declaration of the freedom of conscience announced in the churches.

The discontent was fomented by Prince William of Orange, who

[1] The Test Act decreed that every one who holds an office must take the oath of supremacy, receive the Eucharist according to the Anglican rites, and subscribe to a formula denying the doctrine of transubstantiation.

[2] Cf. *Mazure,* Hist. de la révolution de 1688 en Angleterre, tom. i. p. 166 sqq. 3 vols. Paris, 1825. *Lingard,* xiii. 60 sqq.

Digitized by Google

had long been steadily intriguing against King James, his father-in-law. James ordered the seven bishops who had refused to have his proclamation read to appear before the court at Westminster Hall, where they were acquitted. It was at this time that the birth of a son, the Prince of Wales, deprived Mary, the daughter of James, of her heirship to the throne. William of Orange, her husband, angry at this disappointment, accepted the invitation of several rebellious lords, and landed with an army in England. James, betrayed by the English army and "deserted by his own children," lost courage and fled to France. The Parliament declared the throne vacant, and proclaimed William conjointly with his wife, King and Queen of England.

The sufferings of the Catholics were now renewed. The Toleration Act of 1689 revoked all the laws passed against the nonconformists, and granted freedom of worship to all, save and excepting Catholics and Socinians. In England the Episcopalians were the rulers; in Scotland, the Presbyterians. An act of Parliament excluded all Catholic princes from the succession to the throne. And this sad state of affairs continued during the reign of Anne (1702–1714), and of her successors of the house of Hanover.[1] The Bill of Relief of the year 1778 called forth the insurrection of London (1780), which was headed by the fanatical Lord Gordon.[2]

It was the American War of Independence that first led to the abrogation of the most stringent of these laws which inflicted penalty for conscientious belief. A further relief was afforded to Catholics by the Emancipation Bill in 1829.

§ 179. *The Sufferings of the Catholics in Ireland.*

Although Ireland[3] was not entirely conquered by England, it suffered greatly from the oppressions exercised by the latter. The

[1] *Hartpole Lecky*, History of England in the Eighteenth Century. 2 vols. London, 1875.

[2] *Mills*, History of the Riots in London in the year 1780, commonly called the Gordon Riots. London, 1883.

[3] On Ireland, see *Lingard*, vii. *Thomas Moore*, Memoirs of Captain Rock, ed. 1824 and 1852. *O'Connell*, A Memoir of Ireland, Native and Saxon. 1 vol. 8vo. Dublin, 1843. *Brennan*, O. S. F., Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. Dublin, 1864. *W. D. Killeen*, Ecclesiastical History of Ireland. London, 1875. *Thomas D'Arcy McGee*, History of the Attempt to establish the Protestant Reformation in Ireland. Boston, 1853. The Analecta of David Rothe, Bishop of Ossory, edited with an Introduction by *P. F. Moran*, Bishop of Ossory. Dublin, 1884. *Bagwell*, Ireland under the Tudors. London, 1885. (See Dublin Review, Apr. 1886.)

Digitized by Google

members of the so-called Irish Parliament, who decided on the destinies of the island, were selected from English colonists who had recognized the supremacy of Henry VIII. in 1536. George Brown, who was appointed to the Archiepiscopal See of Dublin by Cromwell, the tool of Henry VIII., submitted willingly to this recognition. But the native clergy and the people of the country opposed with persevering and vigorous resistance the encroachments of the tyrant. Under Edward VI. there were but few of the natives who did not withstand the introduction of the English liturgy into Ireland; Irish nationality and the Catholic faith remained bound up together. Under Queen Mary (1553–1558) the Irish enjoyed their faith, and Protestantism became nearly extinct in Ireland. This hopeful aspect of affairs was, however, entirely changed by Elizabeth, who was intent on subjugating and protestantizing the whole island. A series of atrocious and systematic persecutions was inaugurated, for which it is difficult to find a comparison. After long and bloody conflicts the Irish were defeated and subjugated (1603). But, despite confiscation, rack, and scaffold, the Irish clergy and people remained steadfast and loyal to the ancient faith.[1] Among those that suffered martyrdom were Dermot O'Hurley, Archbishop of Cashel; Patrick O'Healy, Bishop of Mayo; and Richard Creagh, Archbishop of Armagh.

When James I. came to the throne, the poor Irish people were soon disappointed in their hope of religious freedom. The new king, in an act of amnesty which he granted, excluded from the benefits thereof only "papists and assassins." Catholic religious services were forbidden; and in 1605 all Catholic priests were ordered to leave the country under pain of death. Confiscation and colonization were resorted to, but even this wholesale robbery of property could not suppress the religion.

These unrighteous persecutions continued under the reign of Charles I., who was weak enough to yield to the influence of wicked advisers. The Earl of Strafford, Viceroy of Ireland, used his eminent talents for the oppression of the Irish, and continued the system of robbery. The king, in 1628, granted to the Irish who had assisted

[1] *Lingard*, x. *T. D'A. McGee.* *Warner*, History of Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland, p. 294. London, 1768. Up to the death of Elizabeth not even sixty of the natives had become Protestants. On the great number of Franciscan Observants who suffered martyrdom, see Annal. Minor. tom. xx. sqq. The Order of St. Francis has given to the Irish Church seventy-three bishops, eighteen of whom lived during the time of the cruel persecutions.

Digitized by Google

him with money fifty-one graces, but failed to keep his word; by the influence of Strafford, these graces were not confirmed, but the plundering and oppression still kept on. These drove the people to revolt as a means of putting an end to this grievous wrong. At last the nation arose, as one man, for "God, king, and fatherland." This rising first took place in the province of Ulster. Early in the year 1642 the national convention at Kilkenny proclaimed war for the Irish religion, for independence of the Irish Parliament, for the upholding of the graces conferred in 1628, and for the exclusion of foreigners. A national synod declared these demands to be just and lawful. The combat was maintained on both sides with great bitterness, though at first with success for the Irish, as some outrages committed by the English on peaceful and unarmed natives had roused the natives to take a bloody vengeance. Strafford's successor, the Marquis of Ormonde, concluded an armistice (1643) known as "The Cessation." But the negotiations for peace were frustrated, because Charles, from fear of the English and Scotch Parliaments, dared not grant the Irish that freedom of religion which they demanded with so much justice. When the king afterwards fell into the hands of the Scotch and English rebels, the Irish rose to free him; but being defeated by the overwhelming power of Oliver Cromwell, they had to pay a dear penalty,—the usurper made the conquered feel the weight of his cruelty and of his fanaticism.[1] Loss of their possessions, exile, and slavery became the lot of Catholics. A price of £5 was set on the head of a priest. Five millions of acres were confiscated and divided among those who had advanced money to pay the army; twenty thousand people were transported to the West Indies, and many thousands more to the American colonies. Under Cromwell three hundred ecclesiastics were martyred and one thousand others banished. A law was enacted confining the Catholics to the province of Connaught, which they were not to leave on pain of death. This command could not be carried out; but it furnished the Protector's adherents an opportunity of cooling their fanaticism on the papists. The Protestant Irish were spared completely.

The restoration of the monarchical dignity in England brought no great advantage to the Catholics of Ireland. The regicides remained in possession of the lands they had stolen, and the Catholic owners

[1] Historical Sketch of the Persecutions, etc., by Most Rev. *P. F. Moran*, Archbishop of Sidney. Cromwell in Ireland, by Rev. *D. Murphy*, S. J. London, 1883.

received but a small part of their property back again. The concessions which the king, Charles II., was willing to make to the Catholics met with strong opposition on the part of Protestant fanaticism. A short interval of peace took place under the viceroyalty of Lord Berkeley; after which oppression began anew,[1] and continued until the accession of James II. (1685), who publicly acknowledged himself to be a Catholic. He sent Lord Clarendon to Ireland as viceroy, and granted freedom of worship, with civil and political equality, to Catholics, to place them on the same footing with Protestants. The latter took the alarm; and the hopes cherished by the Irish people were overthrown when James was driven from his throne by William of Orange (1688). James fled to France, whence he passed over to Ireland, to place himself at the head of the Irish people, who had remained loyal to him throughout his adversity; but he and they were defeated by William (1690).

William of Orange began a new sort of persecution in Ireland, which reminds one of the Roman Emperor Julian's administration. The capitulation of Limerick (1691) promised, indeed, freedom of conscience to the Catholics such as they had enjoyed under Charles II., and the peaceable enjoyment of their property; but the conditions of the treaty were not kept. New persecutions were set on foot, which were prefaced by a confiscation of property; and these persecutions continued with increased violence during the reign of Queen Anne (1702–1714), the second daughter of James II. As early as 1698 the Catholic bishops were banished from the island; the priests, indeed, were allowed to remain, but under the most oppressive supervision and control.[2] Attendance at a Catholic place of worship was annexed to disgraceful conditions;[3] and the right of educating their children was withdrawn from Catholic parents, or was at least so hampered as to make it very difficult. The estab-

[1] On the execution at Tyburn (July 11, 1681) of Oliver Plunkett, Archbishop of Armagh, see his Life by Rev. Dr. *Croly*, of Maynooth, Dublin; *Brennan*, p. 446 sqq.

[2] They had to take the oath of abjuration (against the Stuarts), to have their names registered, to give two securities (each of £50); they could never leave their county, or perform ecclesiastical functions in other parishes (1704 and 1710).

[3] Every divine service outside the churches was forbidden, under pain of banishment, as also the use of bells, wearing a priest's dress, and every outward sign by which a building might be recognized as a Catholic church; images and crucifixes were demolished, and pilgrimages punished with lashes (1704). The justice of the peace could question every Catholic as to where he attended Mass, who had said it, and who else had been present. If these questions were not satisfactorily answered, the Catholic was subject to a fine of £20.

Digitized by Google

lishment of schools was forbidden to Catholics.[1] Any one convicted of having sent his children to the Continent to be brought up in the Catholic faith was liable to civil disqualification. On the other hand, the Government established schools to proselytize the children. Catholic orphans received Protestant guardians. Apostasy was rewarded;[2] Catholics were excluded from all offices of State and from Parliament.[3] The purchase of landed property was forbidden to them, and they had already been robbed of the most of what they had possessed in times past. Leases could not be held for longer than thirty years, and the tenant had to leave two thirds of his earnings to the owner. A Catholic practising the trade of an artisan could only do so subject to mortifying restrictions. Nor could a Catholic become a lawyer or a juryman.

The Anglican clergy took possession of the rich Catholic benefices (livings);[4] and the Catholic, overburdened with taxes and robbed of his possessions, had to pay tithe to the bishops and pastors of the High Church, who, having frequently no congregations of their own, travelled away from their homes. They had, besides this, to contribute to the expenses of a religious worship in which they could not join; while the Catholic priests, nearly starving with hunger, had only the free contributions of the faithful to look to for support.

Still more revolting was the insulting behavior to which the Irish

[1] Catholic teachers were banished. Their return rendered them liable to capital punishment (1704). The Government paid £5 a head for the deportation of Catholic teachers to the West Indies. Catholics were not allowed to have their children educated on the Continent, and were obliged to bring forward their children to be seen at the demand of the magistrate.

[2] An apostate priest at first (1704) received £20, afterwards (1705) £30, and at last £40. When the eldest son of a Catholic family turned Protestant, he became possessed of the whole property of his parents, who in that case had only the usufruct of it (1703). Did a younger son or daughter fall away, the Chancellor of Ireland determined their share in the inheritance (1703). A woman who turned Protestant might separate herself from her husband. Priests were forbidden, under pain of death, to solemnize marriage between Protestants and Catholics.

[3] They were not admissible to any office whatsoever, whether in the army, in the magistracy, or of any kind whatever (1703). A law of 1692 and 1703 excludes them from both houses of Parliament.

[4] In Ireland there were 4 Anglican archbishoprics and 18 bishoprics; 326 other dignitaries, 1,330 parish parsons, and 752 vicars. In all Ireland the Protestants numbered about 1,500,000, of whom only about half belonged to the Anglican Church. In 198 parishes not a single adherent to the High Church dwelt. In spite of which the Anglo pastors received the incomes of the prebends.

Digitized by Google

were subject from their Protestant landlords, from government officers, at theatres,[1] and public places, without being protected by the law-courts from such misusage; such protection being nevertheless due to the lowest individual when calumniated or ill-treated.

This was a tyranny of which the history of civilized nations offers no other example, and it had to be suffered by a people whose only crime was their loyalty to the Catholic faith.

During the reigns of George I. and of George II. these disgraceful laws remained in full force; nay, new ones were added to them. It was when English statesmen began to perceive how fruitless were such measures, and when the War of Independence broke out in America, that they began to feel the necessity of awarding some measure of justice to the Irish Catholics. Their lot underwent some amelioration in 1778, and especially after the Irish Parliament was freed from its state of vassalage to the English Parliament in 1782.[2]

Further concessions were granted by the relief acts of 1792 and 1793, when the French Revolution inspired the Government of Great Britain with fear.[3] The insurrection in Ireland (1798), which the Catholic clergy opposed with all their energy, was followed by the union of Ireland with England, and the dissolution of the Irish Parliament. The condition of the Catholics was in no degree bettered by this measure. It was the Bill of Emancipation in 1829 that raised them the first step from their condition as helots.

[1] *Beaumont*, l. c. i. 129 sqq.

[2] In the year 1778 Catholics were permitted to rent land for nine hundred and ninety-nine years; moreover, the law before-named in favor of children who became Protestants was revoked, and the same law of inheritance was made applicable to Catholics as to Protestants. In the year 1782 they were permitted to acquire landed property by purchase or inheritance, to possess horses above the value of £5, to establish schools, to become guardians; besides this, the laws which punished the Catholic priest for performing his functions, and the layman for refusing to say where he had heard Mass, were repealed. The law concerning the immovability of the judges, and the introduction of the Habeas Corpus Act, were also of advantage to Ireland.

[3] In the year 1792 the Catholics obtained permission to practise as lawyers, to receive apprentices, and to contract mixed marriages. In 1793 the right of educating their own children was restored to them; the right of voting at elections for members of Parliament (not of being elected) was given to them; and also the right of admission to those civil and military offices which did not require the test oath; while the act of uniformity which required them to attend the Anglican worship was abolished.

Digitized by Google

§ 180. *Apostasy in Scandinavia.*

The expulsion of Christian II.,[1] the King of Denmark and the tyrant of the Union, together with the election of Gustavus (Ericson) Wasa to the throne in 1523, was in Sweden followed by a great change in religious matters, since the newly elected king availed himself of Lutheranism in order to win for the crown the political rights of the bishops and the property of the Church.

At first Gustavus contented himself with favoring the spread of the Lutheran heresy, for which from the year 1519 the brothers Olaf and Lorenzo Peterson, and at a later period Lorenzo Anderson, labored; striving, in fact, to undermine the Catholic faith without formally breaking with the Church. This, however, led to no result. The Swedes showed no inclination for the new doctrine in any shape, — either for Lutheranism, for Anabaptism, or for any other; and the earnest zeal of the Catholic bishops confirmed them yet more in their faith. Even the disputation at Upsala (1524) between Olaf Peterson and Peter Galle won no victory for Lutheranism. It was the threat of the king to abdicate the crown that induced the Diet of Westeraes (1527), in spite of the remonstrances of the bishops, to give the Catholic Church and her property into his royal hands.

The king now proceeded to inaugurate the reformation by a law of censure, and by heavy penalties he provided against a reaction. To deceive the people, he, at the Synod of Oerebro, retained many Catholic usages. On the other hand, he was eager to obtain possession of all Church property, — of the valuable vessels, the vestments, and even of the bells.

The introduction of the new doctrine met with great opposition. Gustavus put down the rebellion, but came into collision with the preachers who withstood his despotism. The moral effects[2] of this so-called reformation were by no means gratifying. Olaf Peterson and Lorenzo Anderson were condemned to death for high-treason,

[1] The treaty called the Union of Calmar (1397) placed the three united kingdoms of the North (Sweden, Norway, and Denmark) under the supremacy of the Danish King. Sten Sture, the Regent of Sweden, sought to free his country from the thraldom of Denmark. Christian II. conquered him, and after his coronation by Archbishop Trolle of Upsala, he commenced a course of extermination at Stockholm. Among those he put to death were ninety-four Swedes of high birth, one of whom was the father of Gustavus Wasa.

[2] See the pastoral letter of Lorenzo Peterson, 1558. *Baazii,* Inventarium eccl. Suevo-goth. p. 271. sqq. Lincop. 1642.

Digitized by Google

having conspired against the king's life; their sentence was remitted, however, on payment of a heavy fine.

The attempt of Erich XIV. (1560–1568) to introduce Calvinism cost him his throne (+1577). Under his successor, John III. (1568–1592), prospects seemed more favorable for the Catholic religion, love for which still dwelt in the hearts of the Swedish people. In the year 1571 the liturgy received some Catholic additions. The new archbishop of Upsala, Lorenzo Peterson Gothus, was consecrated according to the Catholic rite, and the new liturgy published under his name received the approbation of the diet (1577). Only Charles of Suedermanland, a brother of the king, protected Lutheranism.

In the same year the king, through his chancellor, Peter Fecht, and the nobleman Pontus de la Gardie, entered into negotiations with the Apostolic See, which were carried forward by the learned Jesuit Anthony Possevin, papal legate in Stockholm. As, however, the Pope could not concede every demand made by John, the latter, after the death of the Catholic queen, Catherine (1583), was influenced by his second wife, Guneila Bjelke, again to favor Lutheranism, after which all that he retained was the liturgy.

After the death of John, whose Catholic successor, Sigismund III., was also King of Poland, Charles of Suedermanland, at the so-called Council of Upsala (1593), had the liturgy rejected and the Augsburg Confession prescribed. Sigismund ratified what had been done, though he reaped only ingratitude and abuse for so doing. After Sigismund had left Sweden, Charles took forcible possession of the government, and the Diet of Suederkoeping in 1595 forbade the exercise of the Catholic religion.

The king reappeared in 1598 with an army in Sweden, but was too forbearing with his faithless uncle, who was first elected administrator of the realm; then, when Sigismund refused to accede to the disgraceful conditions proposed to him, he ascended, as Charles IX., in 1604 the royal throne, his pretensions to which he sought to fortify by beheading many of the noblest Swedes in the kingdom.

While Christian II. pretended to enter Sweden as the executor of the papal bull of excommunication, he was seeking to render Denmark Protestant; but in 1523 he was deposed by the Estates for ill-treating the prelates and for attempting to introduce Lutheranism.[1]

[1] "Nobilissimam et ex catholica stirpe genitam conjugem suam Lutherana haeresi infecit, ejusdem haeresis pullulatores contra jus pietatemque in regnum nostrum catholicum induxit," etc. (*Ludewig*, Reliquiae manuscript. v. 321. Frcfrt. et Lips. 1723.

Digitized by Google

His uncle and successor, Frederic I. (1523–1533), had indeed bound himself by oath at his election to maintain the Catholic religion; but in the year 1526 he formally went over to Lutheranism, and at the Diet of Odensee (1527) succeeded in obtaining the decree that Catholics and Lutherans should be placed on an equal footing in regard to civic rights, that priests should be permitted to marry, and that the confirmation of bishops should be the privilege of the king. The Danish bishops could offer no effective resistance. At the Diet of Copenhagen (1530) the Lutheran party, through John Tausen, presented a confession of faith (Confessio Havnica). The bishops caused a written refutation to be composed. The disputation projected was set aside by the Lutherans. The king now took part with them decidedly; but the iconoclasts and the invasion of Christian II., who had been driven from the kingdom, compelled him to proceed with more moderation.

After the termination of the civil war, Christian III., whose election had been opposed by the prelates, had all the bishops imprisoned (Aug. 20, 1536), and at the Diet of Copenhagen the episcopal dignity was abolished by law. The imprisoned prelates could only regain their liberty by resigning their dignities. Their revenues were divided between the king and the nobility. John Bugenhagen (Pomeranus) was invited by the king to come from Wittenberg to complete the work of reformation. His ecclesiastical organization was approved by the Diet of Odensee (1539). The new bishops, or superintendents, were consecrated by Bugenhagen. The Catholic priests were forbidden, under pain of death, to enter Denmark. Efforts made by the Jesuits in after times had no effect.

The inhabitants of the kingdom of Norway, which had been connected with Denmark, had hitherto repulsed all the efforts made by heresy to find a footing among them; but after the flight of the Archbishop Olaf of Drontheim, the introduction of Lutheranism took place through the Government.

Iceland for a long time withstood the attacks of Protestantism, which did not prevail in the country until after the execution of the zealous bishop John Aresen of Holum (1550).

§ 181. *Protestantism in Livonia, Courland, Poland, and Silesia.*

As in Prussia, so also in Livonia and Courland, Protestantism was introduced by apostate members of the Teutonic Order. From the year 1521 the chief commander, Walter of Plettenburg, favored the

Digitized by Google

so-called Reformation in Livonia, where, when William Margrave of Brandenburg (1539) had been elevated to the archiepiscopal see of Riga, Protestantism could freely spread. In Courland, when the chief commander, Gotthard Kettler, in 1561 assumed the title of Duke, he also accepted the Confession of Augsburg. The apostasy of the Bishop of Courland, John of Mönnichhausen, facilitated the victory of the novel heresy.

The watchfulness of Sigismund I. (+ 1548) and of the episcopate, particularly that of the able archbishop of Gnesen, John Laski (+ 1531), could not indeed hinder the introduction of Protestantism into Poland,[1] but it rendered the spread of it more difficult. Yet under the feeble and vacillating king Sigismund Augustus II. (1548–1572), Poland became the refuge of almost every sort of apostates, such as the Bohemian Brethren, Lutherans, Reformed Christians, and Unitarians, or Socinians.[2] In order not to divide their strength by doctrinal dissensions, the various sectarians in 1570 concluded the Union of Sendomir (Consensus Sendomiriensis) on a broad basis of belief, which included all parties. The religious peace of Warsaw, 1573 (Pax Dissidentium), granted to all dissenters — that is, to all non-Catholics — religious liberty.[3] The condition of the Catholic Church was seriously endangered, and the more so in that the Archbishop Uchanski of Gnesen (+ 1581) took no energetic measures for the suppression of heresy. But the danger was happily removed by the papal legates Lipomani (since 1556) and Commendone (1563), but principally by the celebrated cardinal Hosius, Bishop of Ermland, who brought the Jesuits into Poland, through whose efforts many dissidents were brought back to the Church.

The kings Stephen Bathory (1576–1586) and Sigismund III., with the Archbishop Stanislaus Karnkowski (+ 1603) and other prelates, afforded powerful assistance to the Jesuit Fathers; and this excited the indignation of the dissidents, who were still more exasperated by some measures taken by the king. Foreign rulers fanned the flame of revolt. It was in vain that Ladislaus IV. in 1645 made an attempt to reconcile the dissidents with the Church, by a religious conference at Thorn, thinking thereby to avert the threatened ruin. His well-meant experiment failed. The distracted kingdom finally fell a victim to the avarice of Russia and her allies.

The Duchy of Silesia, which had been politically connected with

[1] Lubienicki, Hist. reform. Polonicae. Freist. 1685.
[2] Concerning this sect, see § 198.
[3] Nova Acta historico-eccles. vii. 726 sqq.

Digitized by Google

Poland, and since 1392 with Bohemia also, had been prepared for the acceptance of the so-called Reformation by the Bohemian Brethren, the introduction of which by the secular power met with no effective resistance from the weak and in part demoralized clergy. It was the Duke Frederic II. of Liegnitz who first invited the Lutheran preachers in 1523. His example was followed by the Municipal Council of Breslau, who had fallen out with the Cathedral Chapter, and who permitted the Catholic religion to be scoffed at with impunity; they drove away the clergy and the monks who were displeasing to them, and installed the apostate priest Dr. Hess as rector of the church of St. Mary Magdalen.

The half-measures of the Bishop James of Salza were of too undecided a character to avail anything.

King Louis II. (+ 1526) was too much engaged with the Turks, he could effect nothing, and the remonstrances of King Sigismund Augustus of Poland were not heeded. When the government came into the hands of the Archduke (King) Ferdinand I., Lutheranism had already made great progress. Even then the bishops to whom the general government was intrusted might have erected a barrier against the incoming innovations. But, alas! the clergy, both high and low, showed themselves cowardly and undecided, and even manifested sympathy for Luther's errors. The Wittenberg reformer, however, himself found a rival in Caspar of Schwenkfeld, who differed from him in many points.

§ 182. *Protestantism in Hungary and Transylvania.*

The political disorders in Hungary and Transylvania[1] were very favorable to the propagation of Protestantism, the introduction of which had been vainly resisted by King Louis II. and the bishops. After the battle of Mohacz (1526), a part of Hungary passed under the dominion of the Turks, who rather promoted the progress of the new doctrine than restrained it. Many bishops had fallen in this unfortunate battle, and their possessions had been seized by the nobles, who now sought to secure their plunder by adopting Protestantism. Even a part of the clergy, many of whom were far from being models of virtue, united with them. Ferdinand I. and his antagonist, John of Zapolya, dissipated their strength in civil wars,

[1] *P. Ember, Debreceni,* Hist. Eccl. Reform. in Hung. et Transylvania, locupletata a *F. A. Lampe.* Traj. ad Rhen. 1728. *Ribini* (Preacher in Pressb.), Memorabilia August. conf. in regno Hung. a Ferd. I. usque ad Carol. VI. 2 vols. 1787.

Digitized by Google

and could make no headway against the sects, which, under the protection of the higher nobility and even of some Palatines, as Turzo and Nadasdy, continued to spread far and wide. The most active agents in this work were Matthias Devay, in Hungary, and John Honter, in Transylvania. At first Lutheranism prevailed exclusively, but soon found a rival in Calvinism. At the Synod of Mediasch the Saxon nation decided for the Augsburg Confession, the Magyars adopted Calvinism. The Unitarians, or Socinians, whose leaders were George Blandrata and Francis Davidis, also gained many adherents.

In Hungary the Protestants also split into Lutheranism (the German creed) and Calvinism (the Hungarian creed). The disputations, controversies, and synods only served to reveal the interior contradictions of the sectarians without re-establishing unity; but this interior discordance brought many of those who had been wandering from the fold to their senses. At this time, likewise, the Catholic clergy, although hampered in many ways, exerted themselves actively. Among them the Archbishop Olahus of Gran distinguished himself; he invited the Jesuits to Tyrnau in 1561. The noted Stephen Bathory had already brought them to Transylvania. Hated as they were by the Protestants, and repeatedly banished the country, the Fathers of the Society displayed here, as later on in Hungary in 1586, an indefatigable zeal for the conversion of apostates which did not remain fruitless.[1] A great number of the nobility returned to the Church, and established the Catholic worship on their own domains. After the death of Maximilian II., who had favored Protestantism not a little, the Government also adopted more stringent measures. Rudolph II. ordered some of the churches taken from the Catholics to be restored to them, and renewed the laws in favor of the Catholic religion. The Protestants, in unison with Stephen Bocskai, Prince of Transylvania, raised the standard of revolt, and in the Peace of Vienna, 1606, obtained freedom of religious worship.

The distinguished Jesuit, Peter Pazman, afterwards Archbishop of Gran, and Cardinal, labored successfully in the cause of the Church[2] and of his own Society. King Ferdinand II. seconded his efforts; but this imbittered the Protestants yet more, and they, assisted by Gabor, Prince of Transylvania, revolted.

[1] *A. Socher*, Hist. prov. Austr. Soc. Jesu. Vienne, 1740. **Cf. *Barker*, l. c. p. 660.**

[2] *Rimely*, Hist. Collegii Pazmaniani. Vienne, 1865.

Digitized by Google

Under Leopold I. many Protestants mixed themselves up in political conspiracies (1670, 1673), which compelled the Government to have recourse to stringent measures; and the friction between Protestants and Catholics still continued. The Diet of Oedenburg (1681) confirmed the Peace of Vienna, and made still greater concessions; yet the Protestants, still dissatisfied, repeated their demands at the following diets. New seditions took place. The law of 1715, on religion, seemed to be equally unsatisfactory; neither did the Edict of Toleration of Joseph II. (1781) appear fully to correspond to their wishes.

In Italy and Spain the new heresies found no admittance. All the efforts made to introduce them were frustrated in consequence of the aversion of the people, the watchfulness of the Inquisition, and the measures taken by the authorities against the sectaries. The Duchess Renata of Ferrara (see § 172) was a special friend of the so-called Reformation. Most of the apostate Italians passed over, in after times, to Socinianism. *Cantu,* gli Eretici d' Italia. 3 vols. Turin, 1865 sqq.

§ 183. *Relation between the Catholics and Protestants in Germany. — The Thirty Years' War. — The Peace of Westphalia.*

The stipulations of the religious peace of Augsburg satisfied neither Catholics nor Protestants, and the reciprocal bitterness soon became even greater than of yore. In spite of the "spiritual reservations," the Protestants took possession of most of the religious foundations [1] in northern Germany, and rigidly carried into effect the so-called rights of the Reformation,[2] even extending those rights to the Calvinistic States, which had hitherto been excluded from the treaty. On the other hand, they made bitter complaints when the Catholic States reclaimed the secularized bishoprics and the like, or the right to determine the fate of their subjects. Ferdinand I. in vain exerted himself to obtain unity of spirit between Catholics and Protestants. The religious conference at Worms (1558) had the same result as those of former times; and the propositions of

[1] In this way were lost the archbishoprics of Magdeburg and Bremen, the bishoprics of Havelberg, Brandenburg, Lebus, Merseburg, Naumburg, Meissen, Camin, Schwerin, Halberstadt, Minden, Lübeck, Verden, Osnabrück, Ratzeburg, and others. See *Eichhorn,* History of German States and Laws, iv. 146 sqq.

[2] In the Palatinate religion was three times changed by the ruler between 1563 and 1584. The imperial city, Oppenheim, had to change its religion ten times before the Peace of Westphalia.

Digitized by Google

peace made by Witzel, F. Staphylus, and George Cassander could not obtain a hearing. The Protestant States even refused to introduce into their territory the almanac which had been amended by Pope Gregory XIII. While men's tempers were in this state, various events occurred which tended to increase the hostile feeling on both sides and bring matters to a crisis.

Henry IV. of France took advantage of the inimical sentiments of some of these Protestant princes, to weaken the house of Hapsburg and humble the imperial power. It was mainly at his instigation that the Calvinistic princes at Ahausen, in Franconia, formed the Protestant Union in 1608 (May 4), of which Elector Frederic IV. of the Palatinate became the head (+1610). The Catholic princes opposed to this the Holy League, formed at Munich on the 10th of July, 1609, under Duke Maximilian of Bavaria. Germany at that moment was on the eve of a terrible civil war, which the assassination of Henry IV. hindered from breaking out immediately.

The religious conflicts in Bohemia finally gave the signal for beginning that war, which devastated Germany, degraded her princes, and offered to foreign potentates the opportunity of intermeddling with the interior affairs of the country.

Notwithstanding the penal edicts, the so-called Reformation had made its way into the hereditary territories of the emperor.

Maximilian II. had in 1571 granted to the Protestants of Bohemia, who were at war alike with the Church and with their king, a religious liberty, which was, however, limited to the lords and knights. The sectarians, fortified by the Utraquists who had gone over to them, extended these concessions to the cities, and in 1609 extorted from Rudolph II. an imperial rescript by which their demands were granted, while the Protestants in Silesia and Austria obtained by force similar concessions for themselves.

Under Matthias disorders broke out in Bohemia, occasioned by the erection of Protestant churches on the domain of Catholic landlords, in violation of the imperial rescript. The pulling down or closing of these churches by command of the emperor brought about the revolt. The rebels, headed by the Count of Thurn, made their way into the royal castle at Prague (May 23, 1618), threw the two imperial counsellors, Martinitz and Slawata, out of the window, and set up a new government; then, aided and abetted by the Protestant Union, they not only persecuted the Catholics and those cities of Bohemia which remained faithful to the king, but made their way into Austria also.

Digitized by Google

On the death of the Emperor Matthias (1619), the Protestants of Bohemia, unwilling to recognize his nephew, Ferdinand II., as his successor, bestowed the crown on Frederic V. of the Palatinate. Ferdinand II., although reduced to great necessity, remained steadfast in his most embarrassing condition, and finally, with the aid of the Elector of Saxony and Duke Maximilian of Bavaria, defeated Frederic in the battle on the White Mountain near Prague (Nov. 8, 1620). Some other attempts were set on foot by his adherents, but the imperial generals, Tilly[1] and Wallenstein, defeated the champions of Frederic's cause.

The victory of Tilly near Lutter, on the Barenberg (1626), compelled Christian IV. of Denmark, who, aided by England and the Netherlands, had engaged in the war, to conclude the Peace of Lübeck (1629) with the emperor. Frederic lost the electoral dignity which was conferred on the Duke of Bavaria; the rebels were obliged to submit, and peace appeared to be again restored.

The *Restitution Edict* issued by Ferdinand II. in 1629, though just in itself and strictly justifiable, exasperated the Protestant princes, who thought themselves injured in their own interests, and gave an occasion to the Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus,[2] which he had long wished for, of aggrandizing his power at the cost of the empire. Under the hypocritical pretext of rendering assistance to his distressed fellow-believers, he, assured of the support of Richelieu, landed in 1630 with an army in Germany, and with the aid of the Protestant princes, gained a victory over Tilly[3] at Breitenfeld, near Leipsic, 1631, whence his troops, murdering and plundering, marched forward into southern Germany.

After the death of Tilly, Wallenstein became commander-in-chief. The King of Sweden met his death at the battle of Lützen, in Saxony (Nov. 6, 1632). The war was, however, not yet at an end. The ambiguous conduct of Wallenstein and the French subsidies gave encouragement to the Swedish generals to continue hostilities

[1] Concerning the so shamefully calumniated Tilly, the brave and virtuous general of the League, see *Villermont*, Tilly; or, the Thirty Years' War. For the history of the whole war, see the important writings of Onno Klopp.

[2] Historical researches have unveiled the true plan of the Swedish king, who has been the object of so much unmerited praise. Before his invasion of Germany he had already entered into treasonable relationship with the enemies of the German Empire. See the historians *Gfrörer*, *Onno Klopp*, *Droysen*, *Chronholm*, *Hurter*, *Leo*, and others.

[3] On the 20th of May (1631) Magdeburg was taken by Tilly, but *Heising* and others prove that he (Tilly) was not responsible for the destruction of the city.

Digitized by Google

under the command of Duke Bernhard of Weimar. The rebellious Protestant princes were so lost to every honorable feeling as submissively to entreat Oxenstiern, the Swedish Chancellor, to undertake the direction of the new confederation of the Protestant States.

The battle of Nördlingen (1634) ended with victory to the emperor, with whom the Elector of Saxony then concluded the Peace of Prague (May 30, 1635). The interests of France and Sweden, however, demanded the continuance of the contest; and unhappy Germany, betrayed and humiliated by her own princes, had to be for long years the scene of a civil war which converted her most beautiful provinces into deserts. It was in vain that Ferdinand II. (+ 1637) and his son Ferdinand III. sought to put an end to it. The war continued with varying fortune till the year 1648. Then the *Peace of Westphalia* was concluded, which deprived Germany of several provinces, opened the way for foreign potentates to interfere in the interior regulation of affairs, and sanctioned the so-called right of the States to introduce the Reformation. Not only the Lutherans, but the Calvinists or members of the Reformed Church also were recognized and considered as a religious body. The protest of the papal legate Fabio Chigi against the articles of the treaty which violated the rights of the Catholic Church, and the ratification of this protest by Innocent X. in his bull "Zelo domus Dei," of the 26th of November, 1648, were not taken notice of, or in any way treated with respect.

The Peace of Westphalia fixed Jan. 1, 1624, as the normal day ("dies decretorius") with regard to the secularization of ecclesiastical property (Art. 5, § 1), and confirmed the "reservatum ecclesiasticum" of Augsburg (§ 15). For all matters of religion at the diet the "jus eundi in partes," without regard to the majority of votes was decreed (§ 52, "Corpus Evangelicorum et Catholicorum"). The "jus reformandi" (the right of reforming) was limited by the decision that the Catholics and Protestants who in the normal year of 1624 had public or private divine services should retain them, together with all "annexa religionis" (§ 31). The jurisdiction of the bishops over Protestants was suspended (§ 48). See Instrumentum pacis Westph. in *Meiern*, Acta pacis Westph. *Adam Adami*, Relatio hist. de pacif. Osnabrugo-Monast. Francof. 1707. On the change which the Peace of Westphalia underwent by the so-called Clause of Ryswick (1697), see Instr. pacis Ryswic, Art. 4, in *Schmauss*, Corp. Jur. Publ. p. 1104. *Pütter*, Historical Development of the Present State Constitution of the German Empire, ii. 300 sqq.

Digitized by Google

§ 184. *General Remarks on the Propagation, Nature, and Effects of the Reformation.*

The introduction and spread of Protestantism, as shown historically in different countries, are not everywhere to be ascribed to the same causes.

One cause which conduced very much to promote the so-called Reformation consisted in the unfavorable sentiments prevalent, alike among the clergy and the laity, towards the Apostolic See, and the call so often repeated for a reformation of the Church in the Head and members. This facilitated the work of the authors of the new heresies, who, under the mask of reformers, won to their side many well-disposed men, who, at least in the beginning, forwarded the work of the false reformers.

The frivolous satires and caricatures on the clergy and on the usages of the Church, the popular German writings of Luther, with his coarse attacks on the Pope, and the misrepresentations of Catholic doctrine and institutions made by him and his associates, contributed not a little to the spread of the innovations.

Another cause, not to be undervalued, of the spreading of the so-called Reformation was the Protestant theory of justification, which frees man from the need of co-operation in the work of sanctification, and was most welcome to such as led lives in direct opposition to the dictates of conscience.

The abolition of the necessity for celibacy, and the dispensation from all monastic vows seduced numerous persons to become promoters of the new religion, both from the secular and the regular clergy; the novelty was, in fact, also promoted by the weakness and negligence of several of the prelates as well as of the lower clergy in many countries: to these causes may be added the ignorance of the people and the base avarice of a portion of the nobility and princes.

As regards the common people in particular, they were alienated from the faith of their fathers by various means. As most of the old forms of worship were retained, very many persons did not perceive the interior contradiction between the doctrines of the old Catholic Church and the new errors; while the abolition of the days of fast and abstinence, of auricular confession, and of other precepts and practices so irksome to sensual men, was of no little influence when deciding in favor of the "purified gospel." More-

Digitized by Google

over, the increasing distribution of the Holy Scriptures in the mother-tongue, — the interpretation of which was left, at least in theory, to the private judgment of each individual, — with the communion at the Lord's Supper under both species, and the use of the vernacular in the worship of God, invested the innovations with a peculiar charm.

As for the rest, people of simple earnest faith almost everywhere showed so great an aversion to heresy and those who preached it, that in most places the whole power of the secular arm was needed to tear from the heart of the Catholic Church those congregations which had been deprived of their pastors, even if they had been deserted or betrayed by them.

In this manner the rapid spread of the heresy may be explained; it was principally the work of despotic severity and of tyranny on the part of apostate princes or magistrates ruling over an unprotected people.

The chief characteristics of the various Protestant sects are their denial of the infallible doctrinal office of the Church, which they replaced by Holy Scripture as the only source of faith; their rejection of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the rights of which were transferred to the secular power;[1] their disturbance of the universality of the Church, by founding national and territorial churches, of which the secular ruler became virtually the supreme bishop.

Another mark of these sects which they have in common is the continual change in matters of faith, united to a fearful bigotry and intolerance, which are the more remarkable from the fact that their originators can neither prove their mission and succession[2] to be legitimate, nor in any other way demonstrate that they have received a divine commission.

The effects of this so-called Reformation may be summarized in the following manner: —

Although it cannot be denied that the so-called reformers had a learned education, and did much for the education of the people

[1] At the convention in Naumburg (1554), the Lutheran theologians founded the doctrine of the dependence of the Church on the temporal ruler on Ps. xxvii. 7, "Attollite portas, principes, *vestras*," etc., and on Isa. xl. 23, "Et erunt reges nutritii tui," etc., which they cite from the Vulgate, as the Hebrew text affixes another meaning to the words. *Camer*, Vita Melanchth. ed. *Strobel*, p. 319. The Lutheran and the reformed symbols attribute to princes the dominant power in religious affairs.

[2] The High Church Anglicans are the only ones who seek to derive their bishops from apostolic succession (§ 176).

Digitized by Google

and of youthful students, yet it is not less a fact, acknowledged by the Protestants themselves, that the Reformation exercised a lamentable influence in the decline of learning; that, in especial, the suppression of the monasteries was a great disadvantage for the elementary development of youthful education; and that even Luther uttered the bitterest complaints of this neglect of elementary instruction.

The reformers themselves also describe the moral condition induced by the religious movement as one of neglect of prayer, religious worship, and good works, as shown in contempt for the preachers, in hard-heartedness, debauchery, and immorality among their adherents, and the like. Their words leave no doubt of the destructive tendency of the "new gospel" in all that concerns piety and virtue, and this testimony is confirmed by contemporary and later authors.

History also shows us that the Protestant princes gave their subjects arbitrary rules of faith; that they treated the preachers with contempt, and forced all, both preachers and subjects, to change their religion according to their own whims, or to leave the country.

This tyranny exercised over the conscience was simultaneous with the annihilation of civil liberty. The Protestant princes, with the consent of their theologians, restored and made ample use of the absolutism in political affairs which Christianity in the Middle Ages had so triumphantly overcome. One extreme naturally led to another. Side by side with the duty of obedience to power concentrated in the hands of the prince, came the theory of the lawfulness of active revolt against authority, — a theory of revolt which even permitted the assassination of princes.[1]

While these effects of Protestant principle became daily more

[1] See §§ 164, 170, 172, 173, 178. *Bossuet*, Hist. des variations, x. 45, and Avertissements aux protestants sur les lettres du ministre *Jurieu* (Œuvres compl. vii. 451 sqq.), Défense de l'histoire des variations contre la réponse de M. Basnages, l. c. p. 500 sqq. The Calvinistic preacher Jurieu taught in 1689, in a pastoral letter, that kings are but the depositaries of sovereignty; that they are responsible to the people for the bad administration of this deposit; that the people have a right to withdraw this deposit whenever the public welfare and the interest of religion require it, and in that case to confide it to whosoever seems best fitted to use it properly. Cf. Traité de l'église, c. 21. The whole question is treated at large, with proofs, by *Bianchi*, Della potestà e della politia della Chiesa, tom. i. lib. i. §§ 6 and 7. Cf. *Hergenröther*, Catholic Church, etc., p. 485 sqq. On the existence and operation of the so-called Reformation, see *Räss*, Converts, etc.

Digitized by Google

manifest, and were not without injurious influence on the Catholic Church itself, that Church, through the Council of Trent, was developing the principles on which a true reformation is founded,— a reformation in the Head and its members, which called forth an indefatigable activity, displayed in converting the heathen, in calling back the wanderer to the fold, and, above all, in regulating the moral and religious life of its own members after the true pattern.

The relation of the Catholic States to the Church, especially to the Apostolic See, cannot be represented without touching on ecclesiastical constitution and discipline. It will therefore be referred to in the history of the constitution of the Church and of the development of doctrine.

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 185. *The Council of Trent.*

As soon as the impediments which had heretofore rendered the convocation of an œcumenical council impossible were even partially removed, Paul III. (1534–1549) convoked such a council to meet at Mantua in 1537; but it was found that it could not be held in that city, nor yet in Vicenza in 1538. The Pope, therefore, some years after (in 1542) summoned a new council to meet at Trent;[1]

[1] *Pietro Soave Polano* (Paul Sarpi, a Servite monk), Istoria del Conc. di Trento. London, 1619. This partial and untrue history was translated into several languages. *Pallavicini*, who had been a Jesuit, and was subsequently a cardinal, wrote his Istoria del Conc. di Trento, Rom. 1652, in confutation of Sarpi. Cf. *Brischar*, Criticism on the Controversies of Sarpi and Pallavicini. *Göschel*, Historic Review of the Council of Trent. The protocols written by the secretary of the council, Masarello, Bishop of Telesia, form a principal source of information. These were given to the world by *Aug. Theiner* (see § 238) in an incomplete form, in violation of his oath and against the express will of the Pope, under the title Acta genuina SS. conc. Tridentini. 2 vols. fol. Zagrab. in Croatia, 1874, Canones et decreta Conc. Trid. Rom. 1564, ed. *Judoc le Plat*, Lovan. 1770. From the same author appeared: Monumentorum ad hist. Conc. Trid. potissimum illustrandam spectantium ampl. collectio. 7 vols. Lovan. 1781 sqq. Can. et dec. ed. stereotypa Lips. 1846; ed. *Richter* et *Schulte*. Lips. 1853. Acta et dec. Conc. Trid. ab anno 1562 a *Gabr. Card. Paleotta* descript. ed. *Mendham*. London, 1842. Cf. *Laemmer*, Monum. Vaticana, Friburg, 1861; Meletematum Romanorum mantissa, p. iii. Ratisbon, 1875. Döllinger's Unprinted Reports and Diaries of the Hist. Conc. Trent. Nördl. 1876.

Digitized by Google

and even here, on account of the war carried on between the emperor and the King of France, the first session could not be opened till Dec. 13, 1545.[1] When it did meet, however, there were present the papal legates Del Monte, Cervini, and Pole, with four archbishops, twenty-two bishops, and five generals of religious orders. After the Nicene Creed had been read, at the third session, the assembled Fathers, having agreed concerning the formation of certain congregations, and on the form to be given to the decrees, on the subjects that were first to engage their attention, on the kind and manner of voting,[2] proceeded, at the fourth session, to enact decrees concerning the canon and the interpretation of Holy Writ, on the use of the Vulgate, and subsequently, at the fifth and sixth sessions, to discuss the doctrine of original sin[3] and of justification, and condemned the errors that had arisen in respect to these. At the eighth session the doctrine on the Sacraments in general, and on Baptism and Confirmation in particular, was treated.

The unfriendly relations in which the emperor stood to the Pope after the termination of the war of Smalkald, together with a pestilential disease which broke out in Trent, at the eighth session caused (March 4, 1547) the synod to be transferred to Bologna, where, after some unimportant sessions, it was indefinitely prorogued.

Pope Julius III. (del Monte, 1550–1555) retransferred, on March 4, 1551, the council to Trent,[4] whither, however, the French bishops would not come, because King Henry II., being angry with the Pope, protested against the synod and forbade his bishops to take any part in it.

After two preparatory sessions the Fathers, in the thirteenth session, entered on the discussion of the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, and condemned the errors of the so-called reformers. They, however, gave no attention to the scholastic controversy on

[1] See Cardinal Manning's treatise in the March number of the *Nineteenth Century*, 1877.

[2] The voting was not to be regulated according to nationality, but, as it had been before the Council of Constance, by the individual voices of those present. The procurators of absent bishops were not to be allowed to vote (*Theiner*, l. c. i. 24). The generals of religious orders were allowed one vote, and one vote was accorded to every three abbots.

[3] To the decree the synod added : "Non esse suae intentionis, comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam," etc.

[4] § 170.

Digitized by Google

the mode of Christ's presence in the Blessed Sacrament, whether it is by production or adduction. In the same session a form of safe-conduct was drawn up for Protestants wishing to visit the council.

Out of consideration for them, the council, which in the fourteenth session had defined the doctrines of Penance and of Extreme Unction, prolonged the proceedings in the fifteenth session, and on Jan. 25, 1552, drew up another form of safe-conduct, as the former had not been considered satisfactory. But the expectations they had entertained were not fulfilled. The Protestants had many objections to raise against the new letter of safe-conduct; then they desired seats and votes for their own theologians, fresh discussion of the subjects already decided on, recognition of the Bible as the sole source of faith, the subordination of the Pope to the council according to the decrees of the synods of Constance and Basle, and the release of the bishops from their oath of allegiance to him. Such exorbitant commands could not be complied with by the synod; therefore the envoys from Würtemberg and Electoral Saxony again left Trent.

The revolt of Maurice, Elector of Saxony, necessitated the suspension of the synod. The excellent Pope Marcellus II. ("Cervini") reigned only twenty-one days.[1] His successor, Paul IV.[2] (Caraffa, 1555–1559) soon became involved in strife with the emperor and his brother and successor Ferdinand I., so that the reopening of the council, which was refused by Paul IV., could not take place until the time of Pius IV. ("Medici"), when it resumed its sittings on Jan. 18, 1562. The Pope nominated five legates; namely, the Cardinals Gonzaga, Bishop of Mantua, Dupuy, Seripand, Stanislaus Hosius, and Simonetta. In the first sessions (17–20) no important subjects were discussed, as it was hoped that the Protestant princes of Germany and of other countries, for whose envoys a new form of safe-conduct had been drawn up in the eighteenth session, would send representatives to the council.

After the Fathers had for some time waited in vain for the arrival of these Protestant representatives, they, in the twenty-first session, pronounced decisions on giving Communion in both kinds to the laity[3] and on the communion of children. The following

[1] *Polidori*, De vita Marcelli II. commentar. Rom. 1744.

[2] On the good qualities and zealous labors of this Pope, see *Hergenröther*, Church History, etc., ii. 411.

[3] On the proceedings regarding the chalice for the laity, cf. *Theiner*, l. c. ii. 7 sqq.

Digitized by Google

sessions treated of the Sacrifice of the Mass (Sess. 22), of the Sacrament of Holy Orders (Sess. 23, July 15, 1563),[1] and of Marriage (Sess. 24).[2]

At the twenty-fifth and last session the members of the council occupied themselves with the dogmas of purgatory, of the invocation of saints, with that of the veneration to be paid to images and relics, with the doctrine concerning indulgences,[3] with the precepts on fasting and those on keeping the feasts of the Church, etc.

The Fathers of the council did not, however, content themselves with condemning heresy; they issued the most salutary decrees on reformation.

They attached pre-eminent importance to the instruction and training of the clergy, and laid their injunctions on the bishops to provide theological professors' chairs. (Sess. 5) and to provide seminaries for youth ("Seminaria puerorum," Sess. 23, c. 18, de reform.).

The bond of unity among the clergy was to be strengthened by provincial and diocesan synods (Sess. 24), the holding of which was imposed as a duty upon the bishops.

The duty of residence was inculcated on both the higher and the lower clergy (Sess. 6 and 23). Simplicity in dress and housekeeping (Sess. 14 and 25) was prescribed, and bishops were enjoined to visit and watch over their dioceses (Sess. 6). Regulations were

Pallav. l. c. xviii. 4. The council left the decision to the Apostolic See. Pius IV., by a bull of April 16, 1564, permitted the German bishops, under certain conditions, to distribute Holy Communion under both kinds.

[1] A vehement controversy ensued respecting the question whether the bishops received their power and mission immediately from God, or only mediately from Peter and his successors. The Spanish and French bishops decided for the first view, while the Italian bishops maintained the latter proposition. Cf. *Theiner,* l. c. ii. 156 sqq. *Pallav.* l. c. xviii. 14 and 15; xix. 6; xxi. 11. *Phillips,* Ch. R. i. 186 sqq.

[2] Canon 7, which treats of the inviolability of marriage, at first ruled: "Si quis dixerit, propter adulterium alterius conjugum posse matrimonium solvi, et utrique conjugum vel saltem innocenti . . . licere, altero conjuge vivente, aliud matrimonium contrahere . . . anath. sit." In deference to the representation of the Venetian ambassadors, the canon was so worded as to take into account the condition of the United Greeks, and stands thus: "Si quis dixerit, ecclesiam errare, quum docuit et docet . . . propter adulterium alterius conjugum matr. vinculum non posse solvi," etc. Cf. *Theiner,* l. c. ii. 335 sqq. *Pallav.* l. c. xix. 7, n. 27. *Carrière,* Praelect. theol. p. ii. n. 295.

[3] Leo X. had already given a dogmatic decision on indulgences (see § 160), on which account the council only explained that the Church has received power from God to grant indulgences, and that the use of indulgences is very salutary to Christian people, but that the use of them should be moderated, "ne minia facilitate ecclesiastica disciplina enervetur" (Decr. de Indulg.).

Digitized by Google

also passed respecting benefices (Sess. 7). The jurisdiction of bishops was discussed (Sess. 13); regulations respecting ordination and the installation of clerics were made (Sess. 21). The monasteries also received the attention of the council (Sess. 25). The decree it passed on marriage protected the sanctity of that sacrament. Clandestine marriages were forbidden under pain of losing their validity. This enactment was to take effect thirty days after its publication, which publication was, however, to be made in every single parish. By special enactment (Sess. 25), the Fathers sought to prevent the barbarous practice of duelling, and the misuse of the power of excommunication.

In order to protect the faithful from dangerous reading, a prohibition of certain books was passed, and a commission appointed to make a catalogue of forbidden books ("Index librorum prohibitorum").

The Catechism ("Catechismus Romanus"), ordered by the council, was composed by several learned men, among whom St. Charles Borromeo occupied a prominent position: it appeared under Pius V. (1566), and is truly a masterpiece in form and contents. The improved Breviary was published in 1568, and the Missal in 1570.

After the twenty-fifth session the Council of Trent, which, with two interruptions, had lasted eighteen years, was closed on Dec. 4, 1563. The bull of confirmation by Pius IV. appeared on Jan. 26, 1564.

To the decrees were affixed the signatures of the four legates, and of two other cardinals, of twenty-five archbishops and a hundred and sixty-eight bishops, of seven abbots, and of seven generals of religious orders, all of whom added the words "subscripsi *definiendo;*" also of thirty-nine procurators, who added "subscripsi *judicando.*"

It is true that this synod, so fraught with blessings, and at which the most excellent bishops and the most distinguished theologians were assembled, also met with censure, as had been the case with other councils; but the charges brought against it are utterly unfounded, and to the Fathers of this council[1] belongs the high merit of having investigated and defined with admirable clearness the dogmas of the Church, and of having issued the wisest and most beneficial reformatory decrees.

The Tridentine profession of faith, drawn up at the command of

[1] Of these, the Venetian Jerome Ragosini, Archbishop of Nazianzum, says: "At quos viros? Si doctrinam spectemus, eruditissimos; si usum, peritissimos; si ingenia, perspicacissimos; si pietatem, religiosissimos; si vitam, innocentissimos!"

Digitized by Google

Pope Pius IV., gives special prominence to the dogmatical differences between the Catholic Church and Protestantism.

The decrees of the council, without further restriction, were published in most of the Italian States, in the republic of Venice, in Portugal and Poland. Philip II. also accepted them for Spain and Naples, with the proviso "without detriment to the regal prerogatives." Their acceptance or publication encountered greater difficulties in Germany. Ferdinand I. and Duke Albert of Bavaria expressly demanded the chalice for the laity, and marriage for the priesthood, of which demands the Pope granted the former only. After the death of Ferdinand, in 1564 Maximilian II. had the decrees published in the States of the Empire. The Catholic princes of Germany accepted them at the Diet of Augsburg in 1566. France offered no opposition to the dogmatic decisions, but protested against several regulations of discipline, for which reason a formal reception of all the decrees was not made on the part of the State, but such took place at various provincial synods.

§ 186. *Carrying into Effect the Reformatory Decrees of the Council of Trent.*

Notwithstanding the opposing efforts of heretics and of statesmen who were inimical to the Church, notwithstanding also the resistance made by some depraved clergymen and laymen, the true reformation of the Church in her Head and members, which was inaugurated at the Council of Trent, was gradually carried into effect in Catholic countries.

The moral and religious regeneration of their contemporaries is due to the numerous members of the clergy and laity who were distinguished for learning and virtue, and whose work was essentially forwarded by the new ~~and~~ religious orders and by the great saints of this age. The chief merit, however, is due to the Apostolic See.

All the true reformers recognized, as a chief means of attaining their end, the necessity of a moral and religious training for the clergy, of thorough instruction for the people, of the cultivation of a genuine religious life in high and low, and especially of the frequent reception of the Holy Sacraments.

Properly speaking, the work of reform began soon after the public appearance of Luther, and made a peculiarly good progress under

Digitized by Google

Pope Paul III. (Farnese), who invited the most eminent men to his court in order to have a plan of reform drawn up by them (1537),[1] and who for the same purpose convoked the Council of Trent.

For the reformation of Italy and the lands beyond its boundaries, the following men, most of whom became cardinals, were specially energetic: the Apostolic Bishop John Giberto of Verona, the rules of whose diocese served in many respects as a model to the Fathers at Trent; and his friends the Cardinals John Peter Caraffa (Paul IV.) and James Sadolet, Bishop of Carpentras; and, besides these, St. Cajetan of Thiene, the open-hearted Venetian Contarini, Gregory Cortese, Reginald Pole, Legate of England (§ 189), Fregosa, Bishop of Gubbio, the "Great" Cardinal Farnese, and his colleagues Hippolyte of Este, and Morone, Madruccio, the "Great" Cardinal of Trent, Sirletto, Paleotto, Gesualdo, the saintly Marcellus Cervini (Marcellus II.), the pious and learned Thomas Badia, "Magister Sacri Palatii," Jerome Aleander, Rudolph of Carpi.

With the above, St. Philip Neri and St. Ignatius of Loyola united their efforts. To these may be added the Bishops Thomas Campeggio of Feltri, Aloysius Lippomano of Verona, and Cardinal Francis Commendone, but, above all, St. Charles Borromeo,[2] Cardinal Archbishop of Milan. These all displayed an admirable diligence in reawakening and cherishing true religious fervor.

What Charles Borromeo did for Italy was also done for Portugal by Bartholomew de Martyribus, Archbishop of Braga, whose "Stimulus pastorum" is a collection of flowers culled from the works of the Fathers of the Church. Equally successful is his brother in the Order (Dominican), Louis of Granada, whose merits were publicly acknowledged by the Popes Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V. St. Thomas of Villanova, Archbishop of Valencia, St. Peter of Alcantara, St. Theresa, St. John of the Cross, John of Avila, and others gave a new impetus to religious life in Spain, which was favored and fostered by King Philip II.

In France the person who specially interested himself in carrying

[1] See *Le Plat*, Monum. etc. ii. 596 sqq. *Nat. Alex.* Hist. eccl. saec. 16, c. i. art. 16.

[2] Acta eccles. Mediolanensis. 2 vols. Mediolani, 1599. *Giussano*, Life of St. Charles Borromeo. Histoire de Saint Charles Borromée, etc., par l'abbé *Ch. Sylvain*. 3 vols. Société de Saint-Augustin, 1884. *Dieringer*, St. Charles Borromeo. Cologne, 1846. *Von Ah.* Life of St. Charles. 1885.

Digitized by Google

out the decrees of reform was the Cardinal of Lorraine (Guise). His work was rendered the more difficult by the Huguenot warfare and by the vacillating conduct of the court. French Switzerland and Savoy found an apostle in St. Francis de Sales.[1] He strengthened the faith in Catholic souls, and brought back a number of the wandering sheep to the true fold of the Church.

Great difficulties had to be overcome in Germany. But, notwithstanding this, the true reformation, founded on the decrees of the Council of Trent, made considerable progress. Among the Catholic princes, the Dukes William IV. and Albert V. of Bavaria distinguished themselves by their zeal for religion. Equally successful were the efforts of the three electoral princes of the Rhine, James von Elz (1567–1581), Archbishop of Treves, Daniel Brendel (1555–1582), and John Adam of Bicken (1601–1604), Archbishop of Mentz, with those of Duke Ernest of Bavaria (+ 1612), Archbishop of Cologne and Bishop of Munster and Hildesheim, in purifying their dominions from the heresy with which they were permeated. Their example was followed by Balthasar of Dermbach (1570), the Abbot-prince of Fulda, and by Theodore of Fürstenberg, Bishop of Paderborn.

The two cardinals Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Culm and afterwards of Ermland, and Otho of Truchsess, Bishop of Augsburg, were veritable ornaments of the German episcopate. In Würzburg Bishop Julius Echter of Mespelbrunn, and in Bamberg Bishop Ernest of Mengersdorf, labored for true reformation.

A cheering religious revulsion also took place in the hereditary States of the emperor. A prominent merit of this is due to the Jesuits, who had already been invited thither by the Emperor Ferdinand I., and to the Capuchins. The celebrated Peter Canisius, a Jesuit, for a time administered the bishopric of Vienna, and in unison with other companions of his order labored at the university in that place. Cardinal Melchior Klesel successfully combated the innovations. Finally, it is not to be forgotten that the noble regents of the House of Hapsburg[2] have done great things for the preservation of the Catholic religion.

[1] Vie de St. François de Sales. Paris, 1858. Œuvres comp. éd. Paris, 1836. 4 vols. The best known of his works is the Philothea.

[2] A faithful picture of their lives is given by *P. Gaudentius*, O. S. F., in his Contributions to the Church History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

Digitized by Google

§ 187. *The Jesuits and the Order of Capuchins*

Among those who took an active part in the great struggle against heresy and the moral depravity of the times, were the members of the newly founded orders and congregations, who, taking possession not only of pulpits and of confessionals, but also of professorial chairs at universities and seminaries, strove, by writing learned works, popular books of devotion, and catechisms, by prayer, and by the practice of works of Christian love to one's neighbor, to renew, alike in the palaces of the nobility, in the houses of the middle classes, and in the hovels of the poor, the fervor and piety that characterize Christianity, and by inflaming the hearts that are too much given to earthly considerations to direct them to higher views.

Of these congregations, those of the Jesuits and Capuchins are the most renowned; mutually assisting one another, they were successful alike in refuting heresy and in renewing religious fervor among the Catholics.

The founder of the Society of Jesus was St. Ignatius di Loyola, born in 1491.[1] His order was approved by Paul III. in 1540. Its constitution differs in many points from the rule of the earlier orders.[2] The members of the society are divided into lay-brothers, or temporal coadjutors, and clerics; these again are subdivided into scholastics, spiritual coadjutors, and the professed. Only the last-mentioned add to the usual vows of religion a fourth one, — that of unconditional obedience to the Holy See with regard to missions. The general is elected from the number of the professed. On his part, he appoints the other superiors, as the provincials, rectors, etc., and the professors of theology, who must, however, all belong to the professed. Assistants,[3] elected in the general congregation, are ap-

[1] He was joined by St. Francis Xavier of Navarra (see § 157), Peter Le Fèvre (Faber) from Savoy, the Spaniard Jacob Lainez, Alphonsus Salmeron, Nicholas Bobadilla, and the Portuguese Rodriguez. To them came Le Jay from Savoy, John Codure from the Dauphiné, and Pascal Broet from Picardy. Life of St. Ignatius, ap. *Bolland.* m. Jul. VII. 420 sqq. (ed. Paris, 1868). *Ribadeneira,* Vita Ign. Neap. 1572. Newer biographies by *Bouhours,* German of *Haza-Radlitz.* Vienna, 1835. *Genelli,* Insbr. 1847, etc. See *Potthast,* Bibliothek hist. medii aevi, i. 572. Hist. of the Soc'y of Jesus, by *A. Wilmot.*

[2] Institutum Soc. Jesu, Pragae, 1767. Concerning the institution and fate of the Jesuit Order, see *Cretineau-Joly,* Hist. of the Society of Jesus.

[3] At first there were five; later on, six, — one each from Italy, France, Germany, Spain, Portugal, and Poland. Poland was at last combined with Germany, while an assistant for England has been added. That of Portugal was abolished when the order was suppressed in that country.

Digitized by Google

pointed to aid him, besides which he, with every other superior, has a special admonitor to warn and advise him. The order has houses of the professed, colleges, residences, and mission-houses. Only the colleges are allowed to receive endowments. No special dress is prescribed, nor was the office in choir introduced. Admission into the society is preceded by a two years' novitiate, at the end of which the studies begin. When these are ended the candidate has another year of novitiate to spend. The members of the society are not allowed to accept dignities of the Church except at the command of the Holy Father.

The new community spread very quickly. In 1540 it had already made its appearance in Germany, where the first Jesuit who arrived there, Peter Faber, received Peter Canisius into the order. Here they found a rich field for their labors. In the year 1542 King John III. of Portugal invited them thither. Their first college was established at Coimbra. They were not received with the same cordiality in Spain; for there they found an implacable enemy in the person of the celebrated Dominican Melchior Cano, who was at that time professor in the University of Salamanca (1548). On the other hand, they were all the more aided and favored by the Duke of Gandia, St. Francis Borgia,[1] who himself entered the order, and did much to extend it in Spain.

But Spain did not stand alone in its opposition to the Jesuits; they found enemies as well as friends in France also. To the former, besides the Huguenots, belonged the Parliament, the Sorbonne, and some bishops, — as Eustace du Bellay, Archbishop of Paris. The Convocation of Poissy, in 1561, was the first to allow them to settle down in France, under the name of the College of Clermont. The numerous limitations attached to the permissions happily fell off in the course of time, and in 1564 the Jesuits were allowed to begin a course of lectures in Paris. They were soon admitted at Lyons, Bordeaux, Toulouse, and other cities, so that in a short time many colleges were erected. Unfortunately, the labors of the Jesuits were rendered much more difficult by vehement polemics and persecutions on the part of the Huguenots, as well as by the false accusations and calumnies with which, during the war with the League, they were assailed. The motion for their expulsion from France, which was brought forward by the rector of the University at Paris, James Amboise, and by the par-

[1] Vie de saint François de Borgia. Bruxelles, 1824. *Bartoli*, Saint Francis Borgia.

Digitized by Google

liamentary counsellor-at-law, Anthony Arnauld, did not pass the house at that time; but after the assault of Châtel on the life of Henry IV., they were banished by order of the Parliament of Paris, on the 29th of December, 1594. But this edict was not carried out everywhere, and was in 1603 revoked by the king; whereupon the Jesuits returned to their former houses, to be, however, exposed to new trials after the murder of Henry IV. by Ravaillac (1610).[1]

The order was always held in high esteem by the Apostolic See; but under Paul IV. and Sixtus V. it was threatened with dangers, which were, however, soon removed.

Some years before the foundation of the Society of Jesus the Order of the Capuchins took its rise.[2] Its founder was the Minorite Observant Matthew Bassi, who received (1526) from Clement VII. the permission to wear the genuine dress of St. Francis of Assisi, and to imitate that saint's austere mode of living. The first years of this new society (confirmed in 1528) were years of great trials. Bassi himself retired from the order; and the third vicar-general, Bernardin Ochino, embraced the Protestant heresy, which act of his for a time rendered the whole existence of the order questionable. The danger fortunately passed away; and the society, which hitherto had been confined to Italy, began to make its way into other countries also. King Charles IX. invited the Capuchins to France in 1573, where in a short time they founded several convents. By the exertions of St. Charles Borromeo they came to Altdorf, in Switzerland, in 1580. In 1593 Archduke Ferdinand built them a cloister in Innsbruck. Rudolph II. asked Clement VIII. for some members of the order for his hereditary States. In all the Catholic territories of the German Empire convents of this order were established, especially in the Rhenish archbishoprics and in most of the other dioceses. Pope Paul V. allowed the Capuchins, in 1606, to accept the convents offered to them in Spain. The same Pope granted, in 1619, to the faculty of the members of the order, who had been hitherto subject to the general of the Minor-Conventuals, the right to elect a general of their own, independently of the others.

[1] Cretinean-Joly, ii. 334; iii. 34, 175 sqq. *Matthieu*, Hist. de la mort déplorable de Henri IV. p. 120. *Dupleix*, Hist. de Henri le Grand, p. 163.

[2] Bullarium ordinis fratrum min. s. P. Francisci Capuchinorum notis et scholiis elucubratum a *Michael a Tugio*. 7 vols. fol. Rom. 1740. *Boverio*, Annal. ord. min. qui Capuc. nuncupatur. 3 vols. fol. Lugd. 1632 sqq. *Lechner*, Lives of Saints of the Order of Capuchins. 3 vols. Munich, 1863. *P. Gaudentius*, Contributions, etc., p. 275 sqq.

Digitized by Google

The Order of Capuchins, which bestowed its care and attention in tending souls of the lower classes of society, has been of great service to the Church and to religion. More than one tract of country in Germany owes the preservation of its religion or the restoration of the Catholic faith to the indefatigable zeal of the Capuchins; with equal fervor and generous self-sacrifice they undertook the conversion of the heathen, especially in Africa and America.

With regard to the accusations brought against the Order of the Jesuits, we may add a few words.

1. The assertion that the Jesuits approved and practised the principle "The end sanctifies the means," is an untruth which, contradicted as it is by the lives and writings of the Jesuit Fathers, needs no further refutation.

2. Not less false is the reproach cast at them, that the superior can bind an inferior to commit a sin. This calumny originated in the misapprehension of the words of the constitution, which declares that the rules, save in the observance of the three or four vows, do not oblige under pain of sin ("ad peccatum"), unless the superior's command be given in the name of Jesus, and by virtue of holy obedience. The expression "ad peccatum" cannot be construed "obliged to sin;" but means "under pain of sin," in which sense the phrase is used by St. Thomas, and also in the rules of the third order of St. Francis, and in the Dominican Rule (c. 4–6: "Regulae nostrae non obligent nos *ad culpam sed ad poenam* nisi propter praeceptum vel contemptum"). (l. c. iv. p. 13.)

3. With regard to the unjust accusation that the Jesuit Order teaches that the murder of tyrants (not of kings) is allowed, we reply: (*a*) This doctrine was taught long before the foundation of the order. (Compare the assertion of Jean Petit, Doctor of the Sorbonne, condemned at Constance, 1414.) (*b*) Catholic and Protestant writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, even Luther himself (*Walch*, xxii. 2151), defended the doctrine. (*c*) Only a few (fourteen) members of the Society of Jesus were in favor of it, while the great majority of them condemned it; and (*d*) Aquaviva, the general of the society, after reading the book of Mariana ("De rege et regis institutione," lib. iii. Tolet. 1599), which goes the furthest respecting the murder of tyrants, in a decree of July 6, 1610, forbade the discussion of the doctrine, either publicly or privately, whether by lectures or in writings. Cf. Documents historiques, critiques apolog. concernant la Compagnie de Jésus, tom. ii. 82. Paris, 1828.

4. The so-called "Monita secreta" — Secret Instructions of the Society of Jesus — was first published in Cracow in the years 1612 and 1761, and afterwards in Paris and other places. It is the work of a calumniator.

§ 188. *Other Orders and Congregations of this Era.*

The age of the so-called Reformation was very prolific in religious societies, which in course of time came to be acknowledged by the

Digitized by Google

Church as separate congregations or orders. Those who devoted themselves to the education and the literary and scientific training of the clergy, together with the holding of missions for the people, were: —

1. The Theatines, founded by St. Cajetan of Thiene (+ 1547) and Peter Caraffa (Paul IV.), Bishop of Chieti (Theate), in 1524, and approved by Clement VII. They also took care of the sick, and asked no alms, but lived on the "providence of God," — that is, on the contributions freely brought to their convents.

2. The Barnabites (1530) were austere preachers of penance, who at the same time took charge of the seminaries for the priesthood.

3. The same may be said of the Oratorians of St. Philip Neri in Italy, which were approved by Pope Gregory XIII. in 1574, and those of Cardinal de Berulle[1] in France, which congregation was sanctioned by Paul V. in 1613. Both congregations have gained great renown by their learning and their scientific attainments. Unfortunately, many French Oratorians inclined to Jansenism.

4. The Lazarists, or the Priests of the Mission of St. Vincent de Paul,[2] from the year 1624 have effected more good than even the Oratorians in missionary work and in educating secular priests. Pope Urban VIII. in 1632 approved them as a congregation.

5. The Redemptorists, or the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, the founder of which was St. Alphonsus Liguori,[3] Bishop of St. Agatha of Goti in 1732, are to be classed among the most prominent missionaries. In the nineteenth century they have extended their labors beyond Italy.

6. The Passionists of St. Paul of the Cross (+ 1775) also devoted themselves to the missionary work.

Those who especially devoted themselves to the instruction of youth were: —

1. The Congregation of the Oblates of St. Ambrose, founded in 1578 by St. Charles Borromeo, who also occupied themselves in the care of souls.

2. The Hieronymites, or Somaschans (from the year 1526), who

[1] *Tabaraud*, Hist. de P. de Berulle. Paris, 1817.

[2] *Abelly* (+ 1691), Vie de St. Vincent de Paul, etc. Paris, 1664. *Stolberg*, Life of St. Vincent de Paul. Munster, 1819.

[3] On the 7th of July, 1871, Pope Pius IX. named St. Alphonsus "Doctor ecclesiae." Collezione comp. opere di St. Alphon. Maria de Liguori. Monza, 1839 sqq. 68 voll. 12. *Giatini*, Vita del b. Alphonso. Rom. 1815.

Digitized by Google

were principally devoted to the care of orphans. Their founder was the Venetian nobleman Jerome Æmilian.[1]

3. The Fathers of the Christian Doctrine of Cæsar de Bus (1592), and the Clerici Regulares Minores of John Augustus Adorno (1588); the Congregation of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, founded in 1680 by John Baptist de la Salle, Canon of Rheims (+ 1714), and the Fathers of the Pious Schools, or Piarists, of St. Joseph Calasanctius (+ 1648).

The Ursuline Nuns, founded by St. Angela Merici (+ 1540) in Brescia, were devoted to the education of young girls. In 1544 Pope Paul III. elevated the institution to the dignity of a religious congregation. There was also an association of "English Young Ladies," whose rules were approved by Pope Benedict XIV.;[2] and the Order of the Visitation of our Blessed Lady, founded in 1618 by St. Francis de Sales and St. Frances de Chantal, the original and principal object of which was, however, the tending of the sick.

The Brothers of Mercy, founded by St. John of God (+ 1550), and recognized as a religious order by Paul V. in 1617. The Bethlehemites, the Sisters of Charity ("Filles de la charité," "Sœurs grises") of St. Vincent de Paul and the widow Le Gras (1618), whose rule was confirmed by Pope Clement IX. in 1668, and the Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo, to whom the Cistercian abbot Epiphanius Louis de Estival gave a rule of life, devoted themselves to the care of the sick.

The Sisters of the Good Shepherd take care of fallen women. The Nuns of the Adoration were founded for the continual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. But the growth of religious ardor in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was not only manifested in the foundation of new orders; it showed itself also in the regeneration of the older ones.[3] The first order that was regenerated in the sixteenth century was that of the Carmelites, the renewal

[1] Cf. *Bolland*, M. Febr. ii. 217 sqq. (ed. Paris, 1867).

[2] The first attempt at founding such an order was made by Maria Ward, an English lady (+ 1645); yet Urban VIII. abolished the institute by his bull "Pastoralis Romani Pontificis," on Jan. 13, 1630. Nevertheless, separate houses still continued their work, and finally obtained recognition from the Apostolic See. Benedict XIV. gave the last decision through his constitution "Quam vis justo," on April 30, 1749. See *Schels*, The Associations of Religious Women, p. 59 sqq. Schaffhausen, 1857. *Leitner*, History of English Women. Ratisbon, 1869.

[3] On the great reform of the Franciscan Observants after their reunion by Leo X. (1517), see *P. Gaudentius*, p. 240 sqq.

Digitized by Google

of which was the work of St. Theresa and of St. John of the Cross.

The Benedictine Order also underwent a salutary reform in France by means of the Congregation of St. Vannes and St. Hidulph, founded by Didier de la Cour, prior of the abbey of St. Vannes ("scti Vitonis"), from which the Congregation of St. Maur took its rise, the members of which produced valuable works in the departments of theology and of history.[1]

The Trappists are remarkable on account of the rigorous austerity of their discipline. They are a branch of the Cistercians. Their founder is Bouthillier de Rancé,[2] Abbot of La Trappe (+ 1700), who reintroduced the old strict rule of the Cistercians into his abbey.

§ 189. *Exertions of, and Enmity towards, the Holy See.*

The work of the true reformation, to forward which Adrian VI., Clement VII., and Paul III. had exerted themselves so much, still continued uninterruptedly after their death. Julius III. and Marcellus II. followed in the path indicated by their predecessors. Paul IV. was also intent on the preservation of the purity of faith and the improvement of morals; but he injured his own authority by his excessive rigor,[3] especially by his conduct towards the cardinals Pole and Morone.[4] He is also open to the charge of nepotism.

Under Pius IV.[5] the Council of Trent was closed. The same Pope took great pains to enforce the decrees of the council, in which he was greatly aided by his nephew St. Charles Borromeo. His successor, St. Pius V.[6] (Ghisleri, 1566–1572), issued very salutary decrees in the interests of faith and of religious life, which he enforced with uncompromising rigor. He was a loving consoler and helper to the oppressed Catholics of England, while he was a sturdy opponent of

[1] *Tassin*, Hist. litér. de congrég. de St. Maur. Paris, 1726.

[2] *Chateaubriand*, Vie de Rancé. Paris, 1844. *Dubois*, Hist. de l'abbé de Rancé. 2 vols. Paris, 1866. *Gaillardin*, Les Trappistes, etc. Paris, 1844.

[3] On his two bulls, "Quum quorumdam" of Aug. 7, 1555, and "Cum ex apostolatus officio" of Feb. 15, 1559, see *Hergenröther*, Catholic Church, etc., p. 763 sqq.

[4] He deposed Pole from his office as Legate of England, and imprisoned Cardinal Morone on suspicion of heresy. See *Querini*, Vita Card. Poli, c. 31, in Epistolar. Card. Poli, i. 43 sq. Pius IV. set Morone at liberty, and afterward named him as his legate to the Council of Trent. Morone died as Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia.

[5] He founded the Congregatio interpretum. Conc. Trid.

[6] *Falloux*, Vie de St. Pie V.

Digitized by Google

the deplorable policy of the French court, and in other countries also was a firm and indomitable defender of the Church. During his pontificate the brilliant victory at Lepanto took place in 1571, to which he contributed no little share. His decree, however, that the bull "In Coena Domini" should be proclaimed every year throughout the whole of Christendom met with vehement opposition.[1]

Pius V. was succeeded by Gregory XIII. (Buoncompagni, 1572–1585), a man deeply versed in canon and civil law.[2] By founding six new colleges[3] in Rome, and by endowing others, he did much for the promotion of learning in Rome. He sent nuncios to Lucerne (1579), to Vienna (1581), and to Cologne (1582); he also had the Julian Calendar rectified.[4] His relations to the Catholic States were, on the whole, friendly. The republic of Venice formed the only exception. For the embellishment of Rome this Pope effected much; on the other hand, he was not able to suppress the banditti.

Yet this was successfully achieved by his genial successor, Sixtus V.[5] (1585–1590). Being descended from an impoverished family, he had raised himself to the highest dignities, and in this stormy time with indomitable firmness and courage steered the helm of the Church. The administration of strict and impartial justice distinguished his pontificate. By successful financial operations he

[1] This bull is the work of several Popes. Its first composition dates from the fourteenth century. Urban VIII. in 1627 had it revised, since which time it has received no essential alteration. It begins with the words "Pastoralis Rom. pont. vigilantia" (Bull. Rom. ed. Taurin. xiii. 530 sqq.), and contains a catalogue of such crimes as subject the offender to excommunication. It specially condemns public heretics, schismatics, apostates, falsifiers of pontifical writings, pirates, etc.; those who appeal from the Pope to an œcumenical council, or from the spiritual to the secular courts; those who are robbers of Church property or who plunder pilgrims; those who assist the enemies of religion, especially the Turks, with ammunition; those who levy unjust taxes, etc. In 1770 Clement XIV. suspended the proclamation of this bull; also in the Greek Church, on Orthodox Sunday (first Sunday of Lent), heretics and other criminals were excommunicated. By the constitution "Apostolicae sedis moderationi" of Oct. 12, 1869, Pius IX. abolished many censures of the bull "Coena Dom." (Cf. Acta et decret. S. S. concilii Vaticani, Fasc. i. 77 sqq. Frib. 1870.)

[2] Edition of the improved Corp. juris canonici.

[3] These were colleges for Catholic Englishmen, for converted Jews, for Greeks, Maronites, and Romans (Coll. Romanum). He also endowed the German College (Coll. Germanicum), with a sufficient income. *Cordara*, Hist. Colleg. Germ. et Hungar. Rom. 1770.

[4] It was introduced by the bull "Inter gravissima," of Feb. 24, 1582. See *Janssen*, vol. v. p. 343 sqq.

[5] Felix Peretti, commonly called Cardinal Montalto. *Tempesti*, Storia della vita e geste di Sisto V. Roma, 1754. *Huebner*, Sixte Quint. Paris, 1870.

Digitized by Google

laid thé foundation of the papal treasury. He also embellished Rome by the erection of new buildings, and by opening new streets; he likewise enriched the Vatican Library.[1] In the political questions of his day, Sixtus V. took the warmest interest.[2] He labored for the well-being of the Church by reforming the College of Cardinals, whose number he fixed at seventy, by the establishment of fifteen congregations,[3] and by salutary laws of discipline. Nor is Sixtus behindhand in the promotion of learning. Like his predecessor, he also patronized educational institutes. He was feared and honored by the Romans.

The Popes Urban VII. (Castagna), Gregory XIV. (Sfondrato), Innocent IX. (Fachinetto), reigned successively till 1592. Clement VIII. (Aldobrandini, 1592–1605) called Baronius, Bellarmine, and other learned celebrities into the College of Cardinals, undertook the publication of the revised edition of the Vulgate, and appointed the so-called "Congregatio de auxiliis."[4] He reunited Ferrara with the Papal States in 1598, and caused the war against the Turks to be prosecuted with great zeal. The Jubilee published by this pontiff brought about three millions of pilgrims to Rome.

Leo XI. (de' Medici) died twenty-five days after his election, and was succeeded by Cardinal Camillo Borghese of Rome, who took the name of Paul V. (1605–1621). During his pontificate the hostilities began against the Apostolic See, whose relations to the Catholic States underwent a great change in consequence of the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century. The views of the Middle Ages succumbed more and more to the false theories of the omnipotence of the State, which violated the rights of the Church, especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

[1] Sixtus had the cupola of St. Peter's completed, the obelisk (Nero's Needle) placed on St. Peter's Square, and an excellent aqueduct (Aqua Felice) built. The architect he employed was Domenico Fontana.

[2] See § 174.

[3] There were eight congregations for ecclesiastical purposes, which, although not all newly established by Sixtus, were better organized by him. To these the Inquisition also belonged. Paul III. had already given a new management to the Inquisition by nominating six cardinals to form a permanent "congregatio inquisitionis." Pius IV. in 1562 gave them full power to proceed against all and every one, without distinction, who clung to the heresy of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, or that of the Anabaptists. St. Pius V. augmented the authority of this tribunal, and made some alterations in the manner of proceeding. The present arrangement comes down to us from Sixtus V.

[4] See § 199.

Digitized by Google

The first serious struggle with Rome was given by the republic of Venice, in her decrees touching the rights of the Church,[1] which were so full of enmity that Paul V. found himself at last compelled to impose ban and interdict on the Signoria. The Government, however, remained refractory, and banished those of the clergy who obeyed the papal commands. They also ordered Paul Sarpi,[2] a Servite monk, to draw up a special defence of their conduct in writing; whilst Baronius, Bellarmine, and others took up the cause of the rights of the Apostolic See, which they defended with great skill and depth of learning. Finally, by the mediation of Henry IV. of France, a reconciliation took place between the Senate of Venice and Rome. The exiled members of the clergy were allowed to return, excepting only the Jesuits. Nevertheless, peace was not as yet fully restored.

Pope Paul V. displayed great zeal for the purity of faith and for the efficient education of the clergy, for the success of the missions, for a becoming decoration of churches, etc. He devoted special care and attention to the Catholics of England. He aided Ferdinand II. in his contest with the rebellious Bohemians.

Gregory XV. (Ludovisi, 1621–1623) succeeded Paul V. He issued a new decree concerning papal elections.[3]

Urban VIII. (Barberini, 1623–1644) founded the Collegium Urbanum, and in 1626 united the Duchy of Urbino with the States of the Church. Out of fear of the preponderance of an Austrian-Spanish power, the Pope at first lent himself to the policy of the French, and refused the subsidies asked by Ferdinand II. in the Thirty Years' War. It was not till after the successful campaigns of Gustavus Adolphus that Urban VIII. recognized the danger to the Catholic Church from his warfare, and sent to the emperor the help he had requested. Urban VIII. was well versed in the sciences.

[1] *Daru*, Hist. de la république de Venise, tom. iv. 258 sqq. Paris, 1821. The republic forbade in 1603 that churches should be built, that monasteries or hospitals or new orders should be introduced without her permission; and in 1605 she forbade that real estate or other immovable property should be bequeathed to the Church, or sold to it, or even mortgaged to it for more than two years; and she summoned two clergymen before the civil tribunal in violation of the "Privilegium fori."

[2] See § 185. Sarpi, "the theologian of the republic," was greatly inclined to Protestantism, and was, moreover, a furious enemy of the Jesuits.

[3] Constitution "Aeterni Patris," published with the bull "Decet Romanum" (Bullar. Rom. xii. 619 sqq., 662 sqq. He ordered that the cardinals should vote secretly. Besides the form of scrutiny, those of "access," "compromise," "acclamation," and "quasi-inspiration" were also allowed.

Digitized by Google

He enriched the new breviary, edited by himself, with some hymns of his own composition; but he could not quell the disorders in Rome. It was during the pontificate of Urban that the memorable and often falsely described trial[1] of Galileo (+ 1642) occurred, in the courts of the Inquisition, concerning the system of the world laid down by the renowned Copernicus (+ 1543), Prebendary of the Cathedral of Frauenburg.

Innocent X. (Pamphili, 1644–1655) protested in vain against the Peace of Westphalia, waged war against the Duke of Parma, and brought to account the Barberini, who had enriched themselves greatly under Urban VIII. The relatives of this Pope were not without influence over him, — particularly the widow of his brother, Olympia Madalchini.

Pope Alexander VII. (Chigi, 1655–1667), a friend of learning and an efficient prince of the Church, can be reproached with nothing save perhaps too great a love for his relations. He restored the good understanding between the Holy See and Venice, but was subjected to great humiliations by Louis XIV. of France.[2]

Clement IX. (Rospigliosi, 1667–1669) negotiated the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1668, restored diplomatic intercourse between Portugal and the Apostolic See, and assisted the Venetians against the Turks. The taking of Candia by the latter hastened the death of the Pope. He was succeeded by the octogenarian Clement X. (Altieri, 1670–1676).

Innocent XI. (Odescalchi, 1676–1689), an enemy of nepotism, strenuously exerted himself to promote discipline and simplicity alike among the clergy and the people, and he issued very salutary decrees. He lived to see the glorious victory of King John Sobieski of Poland over the Turks under the walls of Vienna (1683). The differences between the Apostolic See and Louis XIV. of France, which had begun under his predecessor, were still further increased during this pontificate.

The proximate occasion for contention was given by Louis XIV.,

[1] *Olivieri* di Copernic. e di Galil. Bologna, 1872. It is remarkable that Galileo's system, when previously brought forward by Copernicus, was not censured by the ecclesiastical authorities. The religious agitation caused by the new impertinent heresies, together with Galileo's own provoking behavior, led to the declaration of the Congregation against his theory, which was, however, by no means a *definition ex cathedra.* See Rev. *J. Gmeiner's* Scientific Views, p. 15.

[2] During his reign Christina of Sweden, the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, and Ernest, Count of Hesse, returned to the Catholic Church.

Digitized by Google

who insisted on extending the Right of Regalia, by which he claimed the disposal of the revenues of vacant bishoprics and the collation of simple benefices until the incoming bishop had registered his oath. This right had, in the Second Synod of Lyons (1274), been confirmed in those bishoprics in which it had before existed. It had since been extended to all the churches in the kingdom. The convocation of the bishops acquiesced in this oppression. Only two of them, Caulet of Pamiers and Pavillon of Aleth, protested against it, and appealed to the Holy See, who took their rights under its protection against the despotism of the king. After lengthy negotiations, the affair was settled by a treaty.

To this difficulty another was added; namely, the dispute concerning the privilege of asylum enjoyed by the residences of foreign ambassadors. The other European courts had resigned this privilege; but the French ambassador, the Marquis of Lavardin, insisted on retaining it, notwithstanding the threat of excommunication; and he abused it so grossly that the Pope was compelled to interfere. Louis XIV. took the part of his excommunicated ambassador, drove the papal nuncio out of France, took forcible possession of Avignon and Venaissin, and appealed to an œcumenical council. Under Alexander VIII., however, he relinquished the privilege of asylum.

§ 190. *The so-called Gallican Liberties.*

During the contentions concerning the regalia, and the right of asylum at the residences of foreign ambassadors, Louis XIV., in order to avenge himself on the Pope, assumed the part of Protector of the Liberties of the Gallican Church, which were now officially established.[1]

Highly schismatic and one-sided views had prevailed in France as early as the fifteenth century, and had found expression in the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in 1438. The Concordat of 1516 did away, it is true, with the Pragmatic Sanction;[2] yet the false principles which it contained were still defended in Parliament, and in the first instance found upholders even in the Sorbonne, while the court neither directly favored these anti-ecclesiastical tendencies nor yet positively attacked them.

[1] On these contentions, see *Gérin*, Recherches historiques sur l'assemblée de 1682. Paris, 1869. *Bouix*, De Papa. Paris, 1869. Acta et decreta sacr. conc. recent. (Collectio Lacensis), i. 793 sqq.

[2] See §§ 128, 129. *Roskovány*, Rom. pontif. ii. 898 sqq.

Digitized by Google

Towards the end of the sixteenth century (1594), Pithou[1] compiled the so-called Gallican Liberties, and Du Puys[2] in 1639 published a treatise in defence of them. Edmund Richer, Syndic of the Sorbonne (1611), and Peter de Marca (1641), afterwards Archbishop-elect of Paris, also wrote in favor of the Liberties, but submitted their works to the decision of the Apostolic See.

The Assembly of the States at Paris in 1614, and the Parliament both took part in this contest; while Louis XIV., on the contrary, suppressed the anti-ecclesiastical efforts, to which even some of the clergy lent their influence.

During the controversy on the regalia, the king altered his mind. At an assembly which he had summoned to Paris in 1681, at which were present thirty-five prelates, thirty-four deputies of the clergy, together with two general agents of the French clergy, he caused to be drawn up a declaration concerning the extent of the papal power in France. The framing of this document had been committed to Choiseul, Bishop of Tournay, who was already at the point of proclaiming a schism, when in good time Bossuet undertook to draw up the act required (March 13, 1682).

A royal edict commanded the clergy to sign the declaration, together with the four Gallican articles on ecclesiastical authority which were annexed to it. The first of these articles proclaimed that the king and temporal princes in respect to temporal concerns were completely independent of Church authority and of ecclesiastical power; also, that princes could not be deposed. The second declared the unlimited force of the decrees of Constance, passed in the fourth and fifth sessions, regarding the superiority of the councils over the Pope. The third affirmed that the use of the apostolic power is to be restricted by the canons; that the rules, customs, and institutions of the Gallican king, kingdom, and church are yet in force; and that the limits set by the Fathers remain inviolate. The fourth recognized that in matters of faith the Supreme Pontiff has the chief part to perform; that his decrees appertain to each and every church; but it added that his judgment is not irreversible ("irreformabile") unless the Church has formally ratified it by her consent. By this the infallibility of the Pope was denied. These articles far surpass the six articles on the Pope which had been

[1] Libertez de l'église Gallicane. In this writing, which is dedicated to Henry IV., Pithou reviews the Gallican Liberties in eighty-three articles.

[2] Traités des libertez de l'église Gall. avec les preuves. He also wrote a commentary on Pithou's work. Paris, 1652.

Digitized by Google

adopted in 1663 by seventy members of the Sorbonne when under compulsion by the Government. Whoever refused to subscribe the declaration was compelled thereto by main force. It was in this way that the registration of this document was forced into the acts of the Sorbonne.

The Apostolic See protested against these schismatic efforts, which were earnestly reprehended in the Catholic countries of Europe. Innocent XI. refused to confirm the appointment of the two members of this assembly whom Louis had nominated bishops. His successor, Alexander VIII. (Ottoboni, 1689–1691), by the bull "Inter multiplices," of Aug. 4, 1690, proclaimed that the Declaration was void; and Louis began to see that he had gone too far; while Innocent XII. (Pignatelli, 1691–1700), who issued a bull against nepotism, induced the king in 1693 to withdraw his edict.

After the death of Louis XIV. the Parisian Parliament again commanded the royal edict to be put in force. Pius VI., in the bull "Auctorem fidei," condemned the four articles, which in after times Napoleon I. again enacted as law. The last condemnation of Gallicanism occurred at the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican.

Bossuet had written a defence in explanation of the Declaration, which, however, did not appear in print until twenty years after his death (+ 1704). Whether the edition as it now stands is the composition of Bossuet is very doubtful; be that as it may, its publication procured for the celebrated preacher for many years the credit of being one of the principal supporters of Gallicanism,—an impression which many minds retain even to the present day.

§ 191. *The Popes of the Eighteenth Century.—Febronius.*

The very first Pope of this century, Clement XI. (Albani, 1700–1721), a learned man and an able prince of the Church, had a difficult pontificate. The war concerning the succession in Spain disturbed the good understanding between the Apostolic See and the courts of Austria and France, and the arrogance of the pretensions to ecclesiastical prerogatives of the "Sicilian Monarchy" made by Duke Victor Amadeus of Savoy, who, in virtue of the Peace of Utrecht, 1713, had become King of Sicily, compelled the Pope to place that kingdom under an interdict. The protest (1701) of Clement XI. against the assumption of the title of King of Prussia by Frederic, Elector of Brandenburg, was of no effect.

Digitized by Google

On the other hand, he succeeded, with the Emperor Joseph I., in adjusting amicably the conflicting claims regarding the right of presentation to cathedral churches and religious foundations. Clement issued the bull "Unigenitus" against Quesnel.

Pope Innocent XIII. (Conti, 1721–1724) in 1722 invested the Emperor Charles VI. with the fief of Naples, assisted the Maltese and Venetians in their struggle against the Turks, and promoted to the best of his power the welfare of the Church. It was with tears in his eyes that he subscribed the nomination of the unworthy abbé Dubois to the cardinalate which was forced upon him by France. Benedict XIII. (Orsini, 1724–1730) settled the dispute regarding the Sicilian Monarchy, terminated the strife between the Holy See and the Dukes of Sardinia and Savoy, and in 1725 convoked a provincial synod in the Lateran,[1] for the improvement of ecclesiastical discipline. The extending of the celebration of the Feast of the Holy Pope St. Gregory VII. over the entire Church called forth vehement opposition in Venice, Germany, and France; and the refusal of the Pope to raise the nuncio Bichi, who had been recalled from Lisbon, to the cardinalate, led to discord between him and the Portuguese court. This excellent Pope unfortunately placed too great confidence in the unworthy cardinal Coscia. Clement XII. (Corsini, 1730–1740) ended the difficulty by creating Bichi a cardinal, which restored the good understanding with Portugal. Disturbances in Italy and numerous offences from the side of Spain disturbed his pontificate. He was the founder of the Museum of Roman Antiquities, and he sent the learned Assemani into the East to buy manuscripts. This Pope founded a seminary at Bissignano, in Calabria (Seminarium Corsini). In 1738 he pronounced excommunication on the Order of Freemasons.[2]

The disrespectful conduct of some Catholic courts towards the Apostolic See, and the encroachments they made upon ecclesiastical rights continued throughout the pontificate of the learned Pope Benedict XIV.[3] (Lambertini, 1740–1758),[4] although he succeeded in coming to an understanding with Sardinia, with Portugal (John V., "rex fidelissimus," 1740), with Spain in 1751, and with others by treaties with each respectively, conceding some points. With the

[1] Acta et decret. sacror. concil. (Coll. Lacensis), i. 345 sqq.

[2] Bull "In eminenti" of April 28, 1738. Bull. Rom. ed. Taurin. xxiv. 366, 67.

[3] Op. omn. *Bened. XIV.* ed. *Azevedo.* Rom. 1747 sqq. 12 vols. Venet. 1767. 15 vols. His bulls are in Continuatio Bull. magni. Luxemb. tom. xvi.–xix.

[4] Vie du Pape Bénéd. XIV. Paris, 1783.

Digitized by Google

republic of Venice alone, which in 1754 had subjected all papal bulls, briefs, precepts, and the like to the supervision of Government before publication, no agreement was established.

At the instance of some Catholic governments, the Pope in 1748 reduced the number of the festival days of obligation; he also renewed, on March 18, 1751, the ordinances of his predecessor against Freemasonry,[1] and raised Fulda to the rank of a bishopric. After his death the conflict against the Holy See was carried on with greater acrimony than ever by the Regalists, Freemasons, and Jansenists.

John Nicholas of Hontheim, Bishop-coadjutor of Treves, a pupil of the Jansenist canonist Van Espen (+ 1728), stood prominently forward as the leader of the anti-papal party. In 1763 he published a book, under the name of "Justinus Febronius,"[2] which was the most correct expression that has been published of the anti-ecclesiastical views of his century. The pretended object of this work was the reuniting of the Protestants to the Catholic Church; in reality, the author sought to degrade papal authority.

According to Febronius, the Pope is, in respect to the other bishops, only PRIMUS INTER PARES, who, without the consent of the episcopate, can neither give decisions of faith nor condemn heresies; neither can he enact laws for the universal Church, nor interfere in the jurisdiction of individual dioceses. But, continues Febronius, as the "Roman curia," chiefly resting on the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals,[3] has in the course of time arrogated to itself various privileges, it is necessary, in the interests of peace, to withdraw from the Pope all these NON-ESSENTIAL RIGHTS, and by limiting him to those rights which are essentially his, thus re-establish the original constitution of the Church. It is incumbent on bishops and temporal princes to effect this end.

Although this work, which is styled, even by Lessing, a "miserable flattery of princes," is only a compilation of Protestant, Jansenist, and Gallican writings, replete with contradictions, and put together without any logical connection, yet it was praised by all anti-ecclesiastical writers, was translated into various languages and turned to practical account by governments hostile to the Church.

[1] Bull. Magn. ed. Luxemb. xviii. 214 sqq.

[2] Justini Febronii, de statu ecclesiæ et legitima potestate Romani Pontificis liber singularis ad reuniendos dissidentes in religione Christianos. Bulloni (Francofurti).

[3] See § 94.

Pope Clement XIII. (Rezzonico, 1758–1769) in 1764 censured the dangerous book, the author of which, at the instance of his archbishop, retracted his errors in 1778. But his recantation was not sincere, as was shown by the commentary he appended to it in 1781. And neither the dubious recantation nor the excellent refutations written by the learned men of this period — as, for example, those of the Jesuit Zaccaria in 1767 and of Peter Ballerini in 1768 — sufficed to undo the mischief and scandal caused by the dissemination of Hontheim's work.

The severely tried Pope had to suffer still greater indignities. The republic of Genoa protested against a papal visitor being sent to Corsica to settle ecclesiastical matters there, and offered a reward of 6,000 scudi for the arrest of the papal envoy. In 1760 the King of Portugal sent the papal nuncio across the frontier under the conduct of an escort of soldiers; while the Bourbon courts, chiefly those of France and Naples, in very ignoble ways avenged themselves on the Pope for the action he had taken against the Duke of Parma, who had enacted several anti-ecclesiastical laws in 1764.

Agitation against the Jesuits reached a high pitch of excitement under the pontificate of Clement XIII. Yet the Pope firmly refused to accede to the demands of Portugal and of the Bourbon courts for the suppression of the order. Clement XIII. conferred on the Empress Maria Theresa and her successors the title of "Apostolic Majesty" ("Rex apostolicus").[1]

His successor, Clement XIV. (Ganganelli, 1769–1774), had less firmness of character. He created the brother of Pombal, Minister of Portugal, Cardinal; abolished the practice of annually reading the bull "In Coena Domini," and suppressed the Order of the Jesuits.

The absolutism of the courts had apparently reached its aim. State ecclesiasticism flourished, and the Church seemed to have no other destiny than merely to serve the interests of the State. Yet in reality the deluded princes had become representatives of principles the carrying out of which entailed ruin on themselves. The political absolutism of the Bourbons led, as a necessary consequence, to the Revolution of which Louis XVI. of France was the victim.

[1] Clement XIV. promoted science and art, aided missionary work, was solicitous for the Poles, etc.

Digitized by Google

§ 192. *Josephism.*

Under Pius VI. (Angelo Braschi, 1775–1799), the enemies of the Church, whom his predecessor thought he had satisfied by sacrificing to them the Order of the Jesuits, began anew to harass the Apostolic See. The acutest sensibilities of the Pope were wounded, not only by temporal princes, but by deluded spiritual rulers.

The religious condition grew particularly sad in the hereditary States of the Empire. Even during the reign of the Empress Maria Theresa, the false enlightenment of the day had been introduced into Austria, and had been encouraged by some prominent men, such as the Jansenist Van Swieten, the private royal physician and director of studies; the Abbot Rautenstrauch, a man lacking in the true ecclesiastical spirit; the ill-famed canonists Eybel and Pehem; and the vain and arrogant minister Von Kaunitz.[1] The destructive tendencies of these erroneous principles soon manifested themselves.

So long as the Empress Maria Theresa lived, the advocates of enlightenment could not carry out all of their anti-ecclesiastical innovations; but their prospects became more favorable under Joseph II. (1780), a prince destitute of true piety, who did not possess the real talent of a ruler, but only sought to carry out what the frivolous craving for enlightenment had devised.

The encroachments of the would-be reformer began by his issuing in rapid succession ordinances regarding the celebration of divine service, including the benedictions and usages of the Church, with regulations concerning processions, pilgrimages, burials, etc.; each succeeding regulation being meaner and more despotic than the preceding.

The anti-ecclesiastical sentiments of the imperial rubric-maker were still more distinctly manifested in his enactments respecting monasteries, especially in his suppression of those orders that were not occupied in taking care of the sick or in the education of youth; it was also shown in the Austrian monasteries in the separation of the communities from their "foreign" superiors.

The monarch, misled by his impious advisers, arrogated to himself the legislation on matrimony; he abolished several ecclesiastical impediments, and forbade his subjects to seek matrimonial dispensations from Rome.

[1] Consult, on the affairs of Austria at that time, the works of *Brunner*, *Ritter*, *Wolf*, and *Fessler*.

Digitized by Google

The emperor also introduced the *placet* for episcopal ordinances, for pastoral letters, nay, even for Church almanacs (directories); and he commanded that the bulls "In Coena Domini" and "Unigenitus" should be cut out of the Church books. On the other hand, this same emperor, by his Edict of Tolerance of Oct. 13, 1781, granted greater rights to the Protestants and to the schismatic Greeks, and by his granting liberty of the press gave facilities for the basest and most impious writings to be disseminated throughout Austria.

As if to fill up the measure of evil, the deluded emperor then suppressed the diocesan seminaries, and replaced them by four general seminaries at Vienna, Pesth, Pavia, and Louvain, together with five inferior affiliated institutions at Olmütz, Gratz, Prague, Innsbruck, and Freiburg, which the students of theology were required to attend, thus to receive under State supervision their scientific and moral training from the professors of enlightenment whose lives and teachings were, according to the testimony of trustworthy eye-witnesses, equally prejudicial to the minds and hearts of the youthful population studying under their influence.

Few were the bishops of Austria who possessed courage and energy sufficient to stand out against the anti-ecclesiastical measures of the emperor. Among them, however, were Cardinal Migazzi, Archbishop of Vienna, Prince Esterhazy, Archbishop of Agram, Archbishop Bathiany of Gran, and Count Edling, Archbishop of Görtz. Most of the prelates either remained inactive in servile and cowardly compliance, or even undertook to defend the so-called reforms. But the protestations and representations of individual bishops had no effect on the mind of Joseph II., who even answered the remonstrances of the Elector of Treves, Clement Wenceslaus, in an unbecoming manner, whereas a unanimous protestation from the bishops would certainly have brought about a salutary crisis, and probably have freed the Church from this her state of tutelage under the State.

In 1782 Pope Pius VI. went in person to Vienna in the hope of averting the threatening calamity; but he was received at the imperial court, and particularly by the minister Kaunitz, in a very unworthy manner. He found, however, some compensation for this in the unfeigned love and enthusiasm with which he was greeted by the people. While the Pope was yet present in Vienna, Valentine Eybel published his insolent pamphlet "What is the Pope?" which was condemned by Pius in the bull "Super soliditate."

While the Austrian bishops thus quietly permitted the yoke of

Digitized by Google

a State Church to be laid on their necks, the bishops of Belgium, with Cardinal Frankenberg, Archbishop of Malines, at their head, the States of Brabant, and the Catholic people protested against the innovations which were to be introduced there; but Joseph paid no heed to their representations, and when he sought by violent measures to attain his end, the whole country rose in insurrection[1] against him. At the prayer of the emperor, Pius VI. called upon the inhabitants of Belgium to lay down their insubordinate preparations for revolt. But Joseph did not live to witness its suppression. He died on Feb. 20, 1790. He had desired to render his people happy; but in very fact, by his reforms, he brought nameless miseries upon his subjects, and drew upon himself the contempt and mockery of his infidel contemporaries.

§ 193. *Contest concerning the Nunciature.* — *The Congress of Ems.*

The example of Joseph II. found imitators in several ecclesiastical princes of Germany, who not only permitted the Jansenistic and Gallican theories to be taught at their theological institutions of learning, but also endeavored to reduce these false principles to practice.[2]

The three spiritual electors were the most forward in the matter, and proceeded to the greatest lengths. Influenced by anti-ecclesiastical professors and spiritual advisers, they desired to restore the "original" (!) archiepiscopal rights, and therewith opened a conflict with the "Roman Curia."

As early as the year 1769 the ill-advised archbishops Emmeric Joseph of Mentz, Clement Wenceslaus of Treves, and Maximilian Frederic of Cologne, had, through their deputies, Deel, Hontheim, and Hillesheim, formulated and presented to the emperor, in Coblentz, thirty-one Desideria, that he might procure the fulfilment of their demands by the Apostolic See.

This letter of grievance is also directed against the jurisdiction of the nuncios, who were a stumbling-block to the archbishops; but the Apostolic See was so little inclined to accede to their wishes that Pius VI., at the petition of Charles Theodore, the Elector Palatine of Bavaria, in 1785, appointed for his dominions a nuncio who

[1] Cf. *Gachard,* Documens politiques et diplomatiques sur la révolution Belge de 1790. Bruxelles, 1834.

[2] Cardinal *Pacca's* Historical Memoirs of his Residence in Germany from 1786 to 1794. *Brück,* Rationalistic Strivings in Catholic Germany. Mentz, 1865.

Digitized by Google

was to take up his residence at Munich. Astounded at this, the above-named archbishops at first attempted to prevent Zoglio, Archbishop of Athens, the nuncio designated, from being sent to Munich. Not succeeding in this endeavor, they formed a union with Jerome, Archbishop of Salzburg, and by their plenipotentiaries drew up a protest at Ems in the year 1786. This document consisted of twenty-three articles, and is known as the notorious "Punctuation of Ems," in which the pretensions are to restore the rights of the bishops, but which in fact make little popes of the archbishops.

Although the Emperor Joseph had promised to aid the authors of the Punctuation, that document did not meet the approval of all the bishops. The Bishop of Spire, August, Count of Limburg-Styrum, and the Elector Charles Theodore energetically defended the rights of the Holy See.

The archbishops obstinately adhered to their anti-papal efforts; and when Bartholomew Pacca, the papal nuncio of Cologne, published a circular letter, in which he declared that dispensations granted by the archbishops in such cases as were reserved to the Holy See were of themselves null and void, they vehemently opposed the acceptance of such a letter, and again applied to Joseph for assistance. But notwithstanding the aid he afforded, the haughty archbishops were finally compelled to renounce their pretensions.

During these contests a prodigious number of writings appeared against the pretended arrogance of the nuncios, whose supposed encroachments were even made the subject of pastoral letters. But the Apostolic See had also able defenders, among whom were some ex-Jesuits. The cathedral chapters likewise energetically resisted the efforts of the archbishops; and Pius VI. in 1790 issued a letter,[1] addressed explicitly to them, in which he demonstrated that their demands had no foundation in justice.

§ 194. *Italy.* — *The Synod of Pistoja.*

The false enlightenment sought to propagate itself in Italy also. Its conspicuous promoter was the Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany, who undertook to play the same part as that which had been taken by his imperial brother; he, however, proceeded with more caution.

[1] Responsio ad Metropolitanos Mog., etc., super Nuntiaturis Apostolicis. Romae, 1789.

Digitized by Google

After introducing several so-called reforms, beginning in 1780, he in 1786 presented to his bishops a more copious plan of reform, containing fifty-seven articles,[1] framed on Jansenistic and Febronian principles, for their examination and acceptance. The greater part of the bishops pronounced a decidedly unfavorable judgment on these reforms. Only three of them declared for the plan of the Government, so that for this time the grand duke could do nothing.

He did not, however, lose sight of his plan, which he still hoped to realize by the help of Scipio Ricci, the Bishop of Pistoja and Prato. This prelate, who was entirely taken up with the Jansenist and State-Church fallacy, summoned a diocesan synod in the year 1786, in order to complete the work of an improved Church organization, by which he meant the adoption of the plan of the grand duke. As promoter of the synod, he appointed the Josephist canonist Tamburini of Pavia.

The Synod of Pistoja held, in all, six sessions. The anti-ecclesiastical spirit which animated the members of the synod, or rather its leaders, many of whom were from the neighboring States, chiefly manifested itself in the recommendation of Jansenist works; in the adoption of the four Gallican articles; in the false reformatory propositions respecting religious orders, the impediments to marriage, the relations bishops bear to the Pope, Church ceremonies and usages, the devotion to the heart of Jesus; and especially in subordinating the Church to the power of the State.

Rejoicing in the success of this synod, Leopold summoned his seventeen bishops to Florence in the year 1787; here a national synod was to be held for the purpose of introducing and adjusting the particulars of these reforms. But the reformatory project was again frustrated by the ecclesiastical spirit of the bishops of Tuscany. The grand duke dismissed the assembly with signs of his displeasure, and now began to introduce the reforms by his own authority. This led to a rupture between him and the Holy See.

Meantime, as early as the year 1787 an insurrection had taken place against Bishop Ricci in the dioceses of Pistoja and Prato; and the indignation excited at his anti-ecclesiastical innovations eventually reached so great a height that he was compelled to resign.

The circulation of the acts of the Synod of Pistoja, and the

[1] The acts and other documents regarding the Synod of Pistoja are printed in Acta et decreta Syn. dioeces. Pistoriensis, tom. ii. Ticini, 1789.

Digitized by Google

profit which the enemies of the Church sought to derive from them, induced Pope Pius VI. to condemn, by the bull "Auctorem fidei,"[1] eighty-five assertions of this synod as heretical, scandalous, etc. Scipio Ricci, after having given a kind of retraction in 1799, submitted to the papal decision on May 9, 1805. Yet, in his letters to his friends after this, he still showed signs of adherence in some measure to Jansenism. He died Jan. 27, 1810.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. Ecclesiastical Learning.

§ 195. *The Theological Studies of this Period.*

The invention of printing and the reawakened impulse given to humanistic studies exercised a powerful, though at first it seemed rather an injurious, influence on learning, which, however, about the middle of the sixteenth century was again guided into the right path, and called forth many learned works in the sphere of theology, the authors of which increased the spiritual attainments of mediæval scholasticism by comprehensive exegetical and patristic studies, and knew how to clothe their thoughts in a truly classical form.

Even *before* the Council of Trent theological studies had reached an elevation which was far from insignificant; this is attested by the most prominent theologians who were present at that council. And yet the flourishing time of theology begins *after* this synod, which by its decrees contributed so greatly not only to the promotion of true learning, but to the religiously moral regeneration of mankind.

The exegetical studies pursued with great earnestness in the sixteenth century were especially those called forth by polemical interest against the Protestants, the leaders of whom sought to prove their heresy by Holy Scripture. Besides learned dissertations, commentaries on separate portions and on the whole of Scripture were made, the literal meaning of which was principally taken into consideration. Critical editions of the Bible, polyglots, and other means of assistance lightened these studies, and essentially promoted them. They flourished in a special manner from the sixteenth

[1] Bullar. Rom. Contin., etc., ix. 395 sqq. Ed. stereotype Conc. Trid. Leips. 1846, p. 292 sqq.

Digitized by Google

to the eighteenth century. Numerous translations of the Scriptures in the mother-tongue were also prepared.

To the more important exegetical authors of this period belong the Jesuit John Maldonat (+ 1583), Alphonsus Salmeron (+ 1585), Francis Toletus (+ 1596), the Neapolitan Agellius, Bishop of Acerno (+ 1608), William Estius, Chancellor of the University of Douay (+ 1613), Cornelius a Lapide (+ 1637), Augustine Calmet (+ 1757), and others.

Without giving up the scholastic method, the great theologians of this time endeavored to found their articles of faith more on Holy Scripture and Tradition. The work of the Dominican Melchior Canus (§ 187), called "Loci theologici," is truly classical; yet the celebrated Jesuit Dionysius Petavius (+ 1625) surpasses him in acumen and erudition: the most meritorious work of the latter was unfortunately never completed. The likewise incomplete work on Dogma of the Oratorian Thomassin (+ 1695) is very valuable, and highly prized by the learned.

Scholastic theology, like positive theology, also received a new impetus. Its chief representatives are the Dominican Dominic Bannez (+ 1604), the Jesuit Gabriel Vasquez (Hispanus Augustinus, + 1604), Francis Suarez (Dr. eximius, + 1617), famed alike for learning and for speculative ability, and Didacus Ruiz de Montoya (+ 1632), the theologians of Salamanca, of the Order of Carmelite-Observants, with others. Among German theologians, the Jesuit Adam Tanner (+ 1632) occupies a prominent position.

But it was the apologetico-polemic theology that called forth the first labors. Beside the controversialists mentioned in the history of Protestantism, we have yet to name the bishops Nausea, of Vienna (+ 1552), and Berthold, of Chiemsee, whose "German Theology" ("Teutsche Theologie") belongs to the most remarkable writings of the sixteenth century. The Louvain theologian, William Lindanus (+ 1588); the Englishman, Thomas Stapleton, Professor at Douay and Louvain (+ 1598); the Jesuit Gregory of Valencia (+ 1603); and the Cardinals Du Perron (§ 174), and Hosius (§ 186), are renowned as polemical writers. But the first place among these writers belongs to the Jesuit Robert Bellarmine (+ 1621), who was as well acquainted with the writings of the heretics as he was with those of the Fathers of the Church, from which he proved the falsity of the new teaching. His brothers in the order, James Gretser, in Ingolstadt (+ 1625), Martin Becanus (+ 1624 at Vienna), as also the two brothers Adrian and Peter de Walenburg (+ 1675), Vicars-

Digitized by Google

General of Culm and Mentz, and Nicholas Serrarius, who closed his career as Professor at Mentz (+ 1609), also deserve to be remembered for their defence of the Catholic religion. Bossuet's well-known and distinguished work, "Histoire des variations," shows up the inconsistencies and self-contradictions of the so-called reformers. Separate dogmas were also made the object of historical research. The work of the Jansenists Arnauld and Nicole on the Blessed Eucharist is of high value.

Morals were, as in early times, systematically treated of, and frequently connected with dogma; many works on casuistry also appeared, in which the principles were first laid down, and then individual cases decided in accordance with them. But among the influences of the time for the promotion of piety and good manners, the ascetical works breathing the very atmosphere of genuine mysticism and of interior devotion were of inestimable value.

Among these, besides the works by the men and women we have already mentioned, may be named with a special commendation the spiritual exercises ("Exercitia spiritualia") of St. Ignatius. Besides these, there are works of celebrated men, theologians, who, like Louis Bail (+ 1670), Superior of Port Royal des Champs, with the Dominican Contenson (+ 1674), and Nicholas Hauteville, Doctor of the Sorbonne, worked out the "Summa" of St. Thomas in an ascetic-mystic manner, and either in sermons or edifying writings added the results to the value of mediæval mysticism.

The writings of the great preacher and "Apostle of Andalusia," Juan of Avila (+ 1568), are of great value; and mystical literature was greatly enriched by the Spanish Jesuits Balthassar Alvarez (+ 1580), Francis Arias (+ 1605), Louis de Ponte (+ 1624), Alphonsus Rodriguez (+ 1616), and the associates of their order, Eusebius Nieremberg (+ 1638), Jeremias Drexelius (+ 1638), chaplain to the Elector Maximilian I. of Bavaria, and James Nouet (+ 1680). Cardinal de Berulle, and Olier, founder of St. Sulpice, the Capuchin d'Argentom, and the Minorite John de Cartagena (+ 1617), are to be numbered among the Mystics. The "Spiritual Combat" commonly ascribed to the Theatine Laurence Scupoli (+ 1610 in Naples), the writings of the two Jesuits Rogacci (+ 1719) and of Scaramelli (+ 1752), are prized as ascetical productions.

The system of probabilities ("Probabilismus"), propounded in 1572 by Bartholomew of Medina, occasioned much controversy among the moralists, and was especially combated by the Jesuit Comitolus (+ 1626). Many casuists meantime adopted this system, which,

Digitized by Google

when the necessary limitations are applied to it, is quite justifiable, but which may, on the other hand, lead to so many erroneous conclusions, and has in fact done so, that the Apostolic See has been obliged to put a check on such degeneracy.

In the sphere of ecclesiastical history, of patristic lore, and of archæology, the French Congregation of St. Maur have earned immortal honors by their critical editions of the "Fathers of the Church," by learned treatises and historico-polemical writings. In these honors Dominicans, Jesuits, and Oratorians participate. The Bollandists have furnished us with a full, copious, detailed account of the lives of the saints, taking as a model for their work that of the Carthusian Laurence Surius. The Cardinal Cesar Baronius commences the list of the great examiners of history in the last centuries. The knowledge of Christian antiquity was much advanced by Mamachi, Selvaggio, Martene (+ 1739), Muratori (+ 1750), Pellicia, and others. The re-discovery of the Roman Catacombs in 1578 — the first close examination of which Bosio attempted with good success — gave a considerable impetus to archæological studies.

The works already before the public on canon law were at this time considerably augmented in number by copious treatises by Aug. Barbosa (+ 1649), Gonzalez Tellez, Fagnani (+ 1678), Pirhing, Reiffenstuel, etc.; as also by the learned works on the constitution and discipline of the Church by Thomassin, Ferraris, etc.; but especially by the solid works on the fundamental position and rights of the Primacy which the Cardinals Aguirre (+ 1699), Orsi (+ 1761), and Gerdil (+ 1802), the Dominican Roccaberti (+ 1699), the Benedictine Petitdidier, the Minorite Bianchi (+ 1758), the Capuchin Benettis, Adrian and Peter Ballerini, the Jesuit J. B. Bolgeni, and others, composed and published.

Pulpit oratory took a higher, more elevated standing when the French preachers, Bossuet (+ 1704), Bourdaloue (+ 1704), Fénelon (+ 1715), Massillon (+ 1742), and others won their glorious triumphs. A more earnest preacher of morals was found in the Oratorian Lejeune (+ 1672). Among the Italian pulpit orators, the Jesuit Father Segneri (+ 1694) shone with brilliancy. Among the Portuguese, Vieyra (+ 1697) made his mark. Germany also possessed no small number of able preachers, to which class belong the preachers at the cathedrals of Mentz, Nausea, and Wild (Ferus, + 1554), Eisengrein (+ 1578), Provost of the Cathedral at Passau, John Fabri (+ 1558) at Augsburg, and others. The manner and

Digitized by Google

way in which the original and witty Abraham a Sancta Clara (+ 1709) carried on his office of preaching in Vienna is, even if well meant, not compatible with the dignity of the Divine Word.

For the instruction and edification of the people, the Jesuit Nakatenus ("Coeleste palmetum"), the learned and pious Capuchin, Martin von Cochem (+ 1712), the Præmonstratian Goffine (+ 1719), the Jesuits Goldhagen (+ 1794) and Vogel, wrote works which, up to the present date, are the favorite reading among the faithful.

In conclusion, we would remark that the great theologians and canonists mentioned above did not confine themselves to one branch of learning alone, but cultivated skilfully and with success every department of theological and philosophical science.

2. Heresies and Schisms.

§ 196. *The Errors of the so-called Reformers.*

The false theory[1] which Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin propounded with regard to justification is intimately connected with their views of the original state of man, and the consequences of his fall into sin;[2] that is to say, they denied the difference between the natural and the supernatural sanctity and justice of man in his original condition, and explained the perfection which is attributed to the first man as a natural good and an essential part of his human nature, whereas this perfection is in reality something supernatural.

With this fundamental error they combined the denial of free-will ("liberum arbitrium") to man, by asserting that all human action is the result of an absolute necessity, "a deed of God." According to this doctrine, original sin is not the loss of the supernatural gift of grace, but a horrid corruption of man's nature, a wicked desire and inclination to sin ("concupiscence"), as the "Solida declaratio" expresses it. In some places Calvin calls original sin "an annihilation of God's image in man;" in other places, "a horrid disfiguring

[1] Lib. symbol. Eccl. Luth. (Confessio Augsb., Apologia confess. Augsb., Articuli Smalcaldi, Catechismi Lutheri; Formula Concordiae), ed. *Hase*, ed. *Koethe* (German), Corpus lib. symb. Eccl. Reform. (the various symbols of the Reformed Church, the catechisms of Geneva and Heidelberg), ed. *Augusti*, etc. *Dorner*, Hist. of Protest. Theology. Munich, 1867.

[2] On the dogmatic contradistinctions between Catholics and Protestants, see *Möhler's* Symbolism; *Döllinger's* Reformation and its Interior Development (3 vols.).

Digitized by Google

of it." Zwinglius considers it as a natural disposition to sin, as an evil from which other sins spring up as branches from a tree.

This condition of interior corruption, according to Protestant views, continues to exist even after justification; for this is only a declaration of justice ("favor externus"), an exterior imputation of the merits of Christ, whose justice is in virtue of special faith, the so-called "fides specialis," imputed instrumentally to the sinner ("justitia imputata") without any interior change or sanctification of man taking place. The "fides specialis" is nothing more than the firm confidence possessed by the sinner that God will not, for the sake of the merits of Christ, impute his sins to him. When, therefore, Protestants say that faith alone justifies ("sola fides justificat"), they understand by "fides" neither the dead faith nor the faith working by love ("fides formata"). The "fides specialis" has nothing to do with faith in its proper sense.

A consequence of this doctrine is the supposition that man can have the absolute certainty of the acquired justification, which justification he can never lose; another consequence is, the assertion that justice is equal in all men, being capable neither of increase nor of decrease.

According to Luther, the loss of justification can only result from unbelief, — that is, from the want of "fides specialis." Calvin, however, asserts that a man who is once justified is absolutely certain of his salvation, and can never again lose the special justifying faith.

This view of the Genevan reformer is but a corollary of his doctrine of absolute predestination, according to which those predestined to life eternal receive faith and justification, whereas the reprobate never participate in the grace of justification.

Another consequence of this erroneous theory of justification is the rejection of the veneration of the saints, since, according to this system, no interior and true sanctification takes place, whence it follows that the sinner cannot acquire a disposition for justification.

Connected with the denial of free-will and the doctrine of imputed justice is the teaching of these so-called reformers on good works. At first they denied the possibility of good works; but gradually they softened down the harshness of a doctrine so repugnant to every Christian feeling, and admitted the possibility of a certain fulfilment of the law. On the other hand, they strenuously denied that good works are necessary to salvation, or that it is the

Digitized by Google

duty of the justified to fulfil the law; thus setting forth a formal contradistinction between law and gospel.

When, at a later period, Melanchthon and the Protestant theologians, in reply to various controversies that had arisen (see § 197), speak of the use of good works to the justified, they still regard them as matters of indifference in respect to the justification and sanctification of men.

The rejection of the dogma of purgatory, of prayer and of other good works for the dead, of indulgences, and the denial of the distinction between mortal and venial sin, were but necessary conclusions arising from the Protestant doctrine of justification.

According to this doctrine, also, the sacraments could not be instruments of imparting grace and justice (" causa instrumentalis "). Luther considers them only signs of the divine promise of grace, a means of confirming the faith of the recipient in the remission of his sins.

Zwinglius and Socinus considered them as "a sign by which the members of the Christian creed can be recognized." Calvin teaches that the sacraments are outward signs with which an interior efficacy of the Holy Ghost is connected.

Luther and Zwinglius make the efficacy of the sacraments depend on the belief of the recipient in the divine promises. Calvin, on the other hand, considers this efficacy dependent on predestination, so that the non-believer — that is, the reprobate — receives only the outward sign, and for such the administration of the sacraments is but an empty ceremony.

Of the seven sacraments, Luther adopted, at least in the beginning, three; Zwinglius and Calvin, only two.

Baptism, according to the so-called reformers, had no sin-destroying power, which the " fides specialis " alone possesses, but is either a sealing of faith, or a sign by which, as Zwinglius thinks, "one is enlisted into a Christian life." The baptism of children presented great difficulties to the innovators. The Anabaptists placed them in a most painful position, out of which they tried to get by adducing various though insufficient reasons for the practice.

With regard to the Holy Eucharist, the opinion of one differs from that of the other. They one and all reject the sacrificial character of the sacrament, transubstantiation, the permanent presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, and the adoration of the same; but Luther teaches that the body of Christ is *received in, under* and *with* the bread (" in, sub et cum pane = consubstantiation

Digitized by Google

or impanation). Zwinglius holds that the Lord's Supper is only a memorial of the suffering and death of Christ; while Calvin adopts a virtual presence of Christ and an interior efficacy of grace as connected with the reception of the bread and wine, but only for the predestined.

Penance has no real signification in the Protestant systems; and although Luther and Calvin do not altogether reject it, — although, in fact, they desired to retain the special confession of sins, — they have another reason for it than that of a belief in the necessity of confession for the remission of such sins as have been committed.

All these opinions were contradictory to the universal doctrine that had been taught by the Church in all ages. To give them a plausible foundation, on which the so-called reformers proposed to establish the truth of their system, and to be able to demonstrate it, they propounded a new rule, asserting that the Holy Scripture is the sole source and judge of faith,[1] by means of which man attains to faith by an *interior* instruction received from God.

From what has been said, it is obvious that Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin had conceived very erroneous notions of what constitutes the Church. The doctrine of justification by faith alone ("sola fides"), and the immediate interior instruction given by God to man by means of Holy Writ, necessarily led to the rejection of the exterior ministry of preaching and of a dogmatical tradition, as well as of a special priesthood, and especially of the necessity of an exterior, a visible church.

They professed, indeed, that the Church was "a community of hearts in one faith,"[2] — something, therefore, invisible, interior, — but, constrained by circumstances, they were soon obliged to admit a visible Church; for, in order to render possible the establishment of particular congregations, the appointment of preachers and the administration of the sacraments according to the new rite, and at the same time to oppose the consequences of their own views, — which first manifested themselves among the Anabaptists, in the contempt

[1] Cf. Formula Concord. Epitome 1, De compend. regul.: "Credimus, confitemur et docemus, unicam regulam et normam, ex qua omnia dogmata, omnesque doctores judicare oporteat, nullam omnino aliam esse, quam prophetica et apostolica scripta, tum veteris, tum novi testamenti." (*Hase*, l. c. p. 570.)

[2] Conf. Augsb. art. 7: "Item docent, quod una sancta ecclesia perpetuo mansura sit. Est autem ecclesia congregatio Sanctorum, in qua Evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta. Et ad veram unitatem ecclesiae satis est, consentire de doctrina evangelii et administratione sacramentorum." (*Hase*, l. c. p. 17.) The Reformed symbols teach the same thing.

Digitized by Google

they had for their preachers, and in the refractory conduct of the people, — these so-called reformers found themselves compelled to acknowledge the existence of a Church invisible in itself and of itself, but at the same time recognizable by the senses, therefore visible. According to their representations, this visible Church proceeded from the invisible Church when the dispersed and hidden disciples of the Savior assembled everywhere, formed congregations, and made preparations for preaching the pure gospel and for the right administration of the sacraments; by which they meant, chiefly, the abolition of the Mass, and Communion under both kinds. The marks by which this Church is to be recognized are, thus, the *right* preaching of the gospel and the *right* administration of the sacraments; whereby no criterion is given by which the true Church is to be distinguished from the false.

It requires but a hasty glance at the history of Protestantism, especially at the manner in which it was introduced, to see clearly that this confused, intricate mingling of truth with falsehood, presented by this view of the Church, is contrary alike to the nature of things and to history.

Although in theory Luther rejected all ecclesiastical authority, he did not hesitate to impose his own subjective opinions as objective ones on others, and to let preachers be inducted into their office ("Lutheran ordination") by temporal princes as sovereign bishops; neither did he, in his controversy with the Sacramentarians, neglect to appeal to the traditions of the Church, to the common teachings of the Fathers.

Calvin, profiting by the experience of Luther, and alarmed at the unbridled licentiousness which had spread throughout Geneva, laid more stress on the necessity of a visible Church, on the duty of obedience to the preacher, and the like, and introduced a kind of ordination to be performed by the presbytery; but it is nevertheless true, that in doing so, his views could neither be brought into harmony with his teaching, nor could he in this way justify his own conduct in having left the Catholic Church.

§ 197. *Contentions among the Protestants.*

The false principle of "free inquiry" which was propounded by the so-called reformers naturally elicited a mass of dissensions among those who adopted that principle; and the dissensions which shortly afterwards broke out were carried on with great

Digitized by Google

bitterness, and were finally decided, not by the authoritative teaching of the infallible Church, but by the caprice of individual princes.

Besides the contentions concerning the sacraments and the adiaphora,[1] there was an Antinomian contest going on, while Luther was yet living, between Melanchthon, Luther, and John Agricola (+ 1566), a professor at Wittenberg, and subsequently chaplain at the court of Berlin. The object of this contention was the signification of the Law, which Agricola rejected, but which Luther wished to be employed as a means of producing a wholesome fear of God. To this contest may be added, as one of the same category, the Majorian conflict, between George Major, professor in Wittenberg (+ 1574), who maintained the necessity of good works to salvation, and the Lutheran zealot Nicholas of Amsdorf, who sought to prove that they were actually prejudicial thereto. The religious conference at Altenburg, 1568, served but to add fuel to flame.

About the same time the assertion of Andrew Osiander, professor of Königsberg, that the justification of man was interior, an actual indwelling of Christ in the soul, and not proceeding from a judicial sentence of God declaring him righteous, led to vehement discussions between the followers of Osiander and the strict Lutherans, at the head of whom stood Joachim Mörlin, in the first place as a mediator, afterwards as the chief of a party. The quarrel lasted after the death of Osiander, in 1552, whose place was filled by the court chaplain Funk; and the followers of Osiander were victorious as long as Duke Albert of Prussia lived. After his death, however, fortune changed. Mörlin, who had been sent into exile, was recalled and installed as Bishop of Samland; his adversary Funk expiated his advocacy of the "Osiandrist heresy" on the scaffold in 1566, and the victory of Lutheran Orthodoxy over Osianderism was celebrated in the "Corpus doctrinae Prutenicum" composed by Martin Chemnitz.

Among the opponents of Osiander was Francis Stancari, a professor in Königsberg. He maintained that Christ was our redeemer through his human nature alone, that his divine nature was not taken into consideration in the work of redemption; but by this he displeased the Lutherans, and had to wander hither and thither until he died, in 1574, at Stobnicz in Poland.

[1] "Adiaphora" was the word used to designate questions of ritual and ceremony, and others of minor importance to those of doctrine.

Digitized by Google

But the Synergistic Controversy, which treated of the co-operation of the will in the work of justification, assumed a far greater importance than the above-named conflict. Melanchthon gave occasion to it. The contest began between John Pfeffinger, professor in Leipsic, and Nicholas of Amsdorf, and was continued by the theologians of Wittenberg and Jena; at length, however, it was confined more especially to the latter place. The chief opponent of synergism was Flacius Illiricus, whose persuasions induced the Duke John Frederic to imprison Victorinus Strigel, its ablest defender, and the preacher Hugel. After the religious conference at Weimar, however, where he declared original sin to be a "substance," he lost the favor of the court, and with his followers was compelled to leave the country. Under Duke John William the latter were permitted to return, and again acquired the upper hand; but the dukedom remained closed to Flacius, who died in 1575. The colloquy between John Wigand, professor at Jena, and the Synergist Paul Eber, of Wittenberg, in 1568, led to no result.

The most formidable enemies of Lutheranism were the Crypto-Calvinists in the Electorate of Saxony. Melanchthon (+ 1560) stood at their head, and after him his son-in-law Peucer, physician to the elector and one of his privy council. Most of the theologians of Wittenberg were won over to their side; those of Jena, on the other hand, held firmly to Luther's doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, and to the doctrine propounded by Brenz of Würtemberg in 1559 concerning the ubiquity of Christ's presence even in his human nature,[1] and accused the Philippists of heresy. The latter, however, drew to their side the Elector Augustus, who, although a strict Lutheran, declared the "Corpus doctrinae Philippicum" to be a symbolical book, which, at the religious conference at Altenburg in 1569, he insisted on all preachers accepting on pain of losing their places. The distrust which the Wittenberg Catechism awakened in his mind in 1571, the secret Calvinists knew how to allay by the "Consensus Dresdensis." The deluded elector even drove the zealous Lutherans Hesshusius and Wigand out of the Duchy of Saxony, in which, after the death of John William, he exercised the office of regency for the heir, who was yet a minor. But his anger was all the more excited by the publication of the "Exegesis per-

[1] With this doctrine the view concerning the "Communicatio Idiomatum" is connected. This was likewise an object of contention between the Lutherans and the Reformed. The latter accused the Lutherans of Monophysitism, on which the others cast the reproach of Nestorianism on the Reformers.

Digitized by Google

spicua controversiae de coena Domini," which laid open Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper without disguise; his wrath then broke out violently against the Crypto-Calvinists, and they had to expiate their offences severely. The Chancellor Cracov and the court chaplain Stoessel died in prison; Peucer languished in confinement from the year 1574 till 1586. Those who were of Calvinistic sentiments were driven from their places, and the strict Lutherans installed in their stead. A medal was struck commemorating the triumph of orthodoxy over reason and the devil.

In order to put an end to the disputes among the Lutherans, a Form of Concord was drawn up on the 28th of May, 1577, in the monastery of Bergen, near Magdeburg, by James Andreä, Chancellor of Tübingen, Martin Chemnitz, a Saxon theologian, and Nicholas Selnecker; this was to serve as a model for doctrine. It was with reluctance that the preachers of the Electorate of Saxony signed this document. In many Lutheran courts the opposition was still greater; they rejected the Form of Concord in so decided a manner that this Formula of Concord became a Form of Discord.[1]

It was not even found possible to force the acceptance of this formula on the Crypto-Calvinists in the Electorate of Saxony; on the contrary, under Christian I. the attempt was renewed by them to regain the upper hand for themselves. The prospects were favorable. The Chancellor Nicholas Crell, a concealed Calvinist, used his influence with the elector in favor of Calvinism, the introduction of which went rapidly forward. Most of the Lutheran preachers concluded that it was best to teach according to the sentiments of the court; those who did not do this were deposed and exiled. Good Calvinists were put in their places. The work thus begun had even better success when in 1590 the Calvinistic Bible appeared, with its interpolations and interpretations. In the year following the Crypto-Calvinists abolished the exorcisms. Then the Electoral Prince died, and the predominance of Calvinists came to an end in Saxony. Crell, after undergoing a horrible imprisonment of ten long years, was beheaded; his followers had the choice given them either to leave the Electorate of Saxony or adopt Lutheranism.[2]

[1] It was not till the 25th of June, 1580, that fifty-one Lutheran Princes and States, at the diet held at Dresden, accepted the Lutheran Symbol in the modified Codex of the Elector Augustus, which also contained the Formula of Concord.

[2] The principal defenders of orthodox Lutheranism were Martin Chemnitz ("si Martinus, scl. Chemnitius non fuisset, Martinus, scl. Lutherus, non stetisset"), John Gerhard, Professor at Jena (1637), and Leonard Hutter in Wittenberg (+ 1616). The

Digitized by Google

A few years after this strife with the Crypto-Calvinists was ended, the Syncretistic Controversy began, through the medium of the learned and conciliatory George Calixtus, who from the year 1619 had been professor at the University of Helmstädt. His very first writings aroused the suspicions of the more strict Lutherans, and these were increased in the year 1629, until the contest broke forth after the religious conference at Thorn, 1645. Most of the professors of Helmstädt, who, together with the Form of Concord, had rejected the narrow views of Lutheranism, and the slandering of philosophy by Daniel Hofmann in 1602, with somewhat of vehemence, now took part with Calixtus; while the theologians of the Electorate of Saxony, Weller, Hülseman, Scherpf, with the hot and excitable Abraham Calovius, professor in Wittenberg (from the year 1650), were violently opposed to him. Calixtus was accused of syncretism and cryptopapism, because he, although continually opposing the Catholics in his polemics, neither denied salvation to them nor to the members of the reformed communion. It was in order to combat more effectually the secret papists, whose friends Latermann, Behm, and Dreier were harshly persecuted and calumniated in Königsberg, that Calovius drew up the "Consensus fidei repetitus Ecclesiae Lutheranae," in eighty-eight articles, without, however, being able to give it the authority of a creed or symbol. The attempts at mediation made by the theologians of Jena proved fruitless; the strife continued even after the death of Calixtus (+ 1656), some of whose disciples became Catholics.

Of the conflicts among the Calvinists, the Arminian disputes in Holland deserve attention. Dissatisfied with the strict doctrine of predestination taught by Calvin, James Arminius, professor at Leyden, moderated this in some points, but found a violent opponent in his colleague, Frank Gomarus. The preachers espoused the cause of the latter; the people, that of the former. After the death of Arminius, in 1609, Episcopius, one of his adherents, presented in 1610 a remonstrance[1] to the States, and desired religious freedom. Two political parties at that time divided Holland.

theological compendium of the last-named was lately edited by *Hase* ("Hutterus redivivus"), with remarks upon it.

[1] It contains the Arminian system in five articles. Predestination is by divine foresight rendered conditional on the human use or application of grace; only those who believe in Christ and persevere in obedience are saved; Christ died for all men; man cannot of his own strength be saved without grace, but grace does not act irresistibly; the believer can persevere in grace, but also he can lose both grace and faith through negligence.

Digitized by Google

Maurice, Prince of Orange, took sides with the Gomarists; his opponent Oldenbarneveld, with the Arminians. Maurice conquered; and that decided the fate of the Arminians. Oldenbarneveld was beheaded, Hugo Grotius thrown into prison; and at the Synod of Dordrecht, 1618, which was attended by Calvinists from many countries, the strictest doctrine of predestination was insisted on as dogma. The Arminians were excommunicated, and forbidden to hold divine service.

The party of Collegiants was now formed. At their head stood the three brothers Van der Codde. They held their religious assemblies in private houses, and separated themselves from the Gomarists (who were divided into Supralapsarans and Infralapsarans), not only by their Arminian predestination doctrine, but also by their rejection of baptism, etc.

In England some Latitudinarians, — among whom John Hales (+ 1656) played a conspicuous part, — and in France some of the reformed theologians, combated Calvin's doctrine concerning predestination.

§ 198. *The Smaller Protestant Sects.*

Several persons, dissatisfied with the half-measures of the orthodox Protestant sects, separated themselves at a very early period from the Lutheran State churches, and became founders of smaller sects, which took principally a fanatical or rationalistic direction, according as the sectaries developed the principles of the reformer on the one side or the other, and gave them thus a wider scope.

While Luther yet lived, the enthusiastico-fanatical Anabaptists in Wittenberg, who founded the new Jerusalem in Munster, made their appearance; and later emerged under another form, that of Mennonites, called so from their founder, Menno Simonis (+ 1561). The members of this sect, who agreed with one another in rejecting the baptism of children, in the doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, in that of justification, in their views as to what constitutes the Church, as well as in their unwillingness to undertake military service or any official duty, in their refusal to take an oath, and the like, at length split into two sects (in 1554), — "Fine" (chiefly Flemings) and "Coarse" (Waterlanders) Mennonites; further, in consequence of a dispute as to the conditions under which a member should be received into their union, in 1664 they received the names of Galenists on one side, and of Apostoolists on the other, from their heads Galenus and Apostool.

Digitized by Google

The spiritual sect of the Schwenkfeldians may also be traced back to the times of the Wittenberg reformer. Caspar von Schwenkfeld, from Ossig in Silesia, was at first a warm follower of Luther, but afterwards rejected his doctrine of justification, together with the authority of the mere exterior word and of the dead letter; he denied the efficacy of the sacraments, propounded new views of the Lord's Supper, and in his doctrine of the two natures in Christ fell into Eutychianism; he was the special advocate of interior purity of life as necessary for man, in opposition to the doctrine of imputed righteousness. Being for a long time persecuted by Luther and his friends as a heretic, Schwenkfeld wandered about restlessly, and died at Ulm in 1561. His adherents have settled in Silesia and Pennsylvania.

As time went on, and Lutheranism developed itself more and more into a dry dogmatism and an unfruitful pulpit polemic, such men as sought for an interior Christianity felt themselves more and more repelled from it. A reaction on the side of such as these against orthodox Lutheranism was inevitable, though it many times manifested itself in a false fantastic mysticism. But the works of J. Arndt (+ 1621), the general superintendent, were free from such errors, as he had made diligent use of Catholic mysticism; while, on the other hand, false mysticism is so much the more apparent in the writings of Valentine Weigel (+ 1558), preacher at Zschopau in Saxony.

The secret society of Rosicrucians, the origin of which is accredited to the satyrical writings of John Valentine Andreä (+ 1654), Protestant Abbot of Adelberg, plunged and floundered deeper yet in the labyrinth of false mysticism, of magic, alchemy, and the like pursuits, from the errors of which the views of the original Theosophist, James Böhme (1624), a cobbler of Görlitz, were not free. The study of the works of the physician Theophrastus Bombast of Hohenheim, commonly called Paracelsus (+ 1541), exercised no small influence in directing the spirit of this "German philosopher." J. B. Gichtel (+ 1710), the founder of the Gichtelians, or Brothers of the Angels, was an extraordinary admirer of Böhme.

The main assault on Lutheran orthodoxy was made by the Pietists, who formed a church within a church ("ecclesiola in ecclesia"). Their spiritual father is Philip James Spener, who in 1666 was at first dean in Frankfort, then chaplain to the court in Dresden, and from the year 1691 provost in Berlin. He died in 1705. In his "Pia desideria," which appeared in 1675, he deeply laments the

Digitized by Google

alienation and decline of Lutheranism, and sought by his pious reunions ("Collegia pietatis") to inculcate and found a system of interior piety. The undertaking of Spener, who rejected the authority of the symbolic books, declared dogma useless in regard to leading a Christian life, and held the theology of "those not born again" for no true theology at all, called forth both approbation and opposition. The orthodox Lutherans, Carpzov and Löscher in Leipsic, were violent to an extraordinary degree against August Herman Franke, Paul Anton, and Caspar Schade, the founders of the "Collegium philobiblicum," and in 1690 succeeded in driving them away.

About this time the University of Halle was established, to which Franke, Anton, Breithaupt, and similar-minded men were called. Thomasius also joined them, although belonging to another direction, so that the university became the head bulwark of pietism. Here it was that Franke founded the celebrated Orphan House. The violent contentions which broke out between Spener's adherents and the orthodox theologians laid open the nakedness and inconsistency of Lutheranism, in the stead of which the Pietists introduced a false emotional system of religion.

Like the Pietists, the Herrnhuters (watchers of the Lord), or the New United Brethren, joined the pride of Separatists, which in them was keenly prominent, to a one-sided emotional enthusiasm. The sect arose from an association of some "Awakened" Protestant with some wandering Moravian brothers (1722), and for spiritual superior had the Count Nicholas Louis von Zinzendorf, who, assisted by his friends Von Wattewille and Spangenberg, in 1727 organized the community of brothers. In 1737 he was ordained bishop by the court chaplain Jablonski in Berlin; but in 1741 he laid aside this office, and called himself only the ordinary of the brothers ("Ordinarius fratrum"). Being driven out of the Electorate of Saxony as a heretic on account of his confused views of religion, he settled for a while in Wetterau, besides which he made several voyages to America and other places in order to convert the heathen. He died in 1760.

The whole community, which laid no stress on the difference of creeds, was divided in 1744 into three tropes (τρόποι παιδείας), — the Lutheran, the Moravian, and the Reformed. Their central point of union is the doctrine of redemption through the bloody sacrificial death of Christ (the Cross and Blood Theology) and that of union with Christ, which Zinzendorf often represented under absurd

Digitized by Google

and sometimes even under obscene figures of speech, in his sermons and his hymns. Divine worship was performed in halls; and Agapae, or love-feasts, preceded the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Many members of this sect took upon themselves the obligation of the hour of prayer; this prayer lasted from midnight to midnight, and the watchers were relieved every hour. On some days relaxation was granted, when private prayer was to supply the duty. The general synod was the appointed guide of the whole community of brethren; by this the united conference of elders was chosen. Individual communities became united in distinct choirs; disputes were decided by the judicial authority of the community. Appointment to places and reception of members and the like were determined by lot, which in the earlier days was also the case with marriages. Among the Lutheran theologians Carpzov, Baumgarten, and Bengel were foremost in the polemical contest with the Herrnhuters; besides Zinzendorf, their defence was undertaken by August Theophilus Spangenberg (+ 1792), the most learned theologian belonging to the union. The sect spread beyond Germany: it found its way to England in 1749, and to Russia; moreover, it had its mission stations.

The Methodists ("Methodus vitae") in England are akin to the Herrnhuters. At first (1729) they formed an association of students in Oxford, under the leadership of John Wesley. In doctrine they did not differ from that of the High Church; but they were intent on cultivating the religious life in their own persons, and at the same time making headway against the increasing infidelity and moral depravity of their age. In the year 1732 the small association received an important coadjutor in George Whitefield, a man of forcible eloquence, who founded schools for the children of the poor, and soon gained great numbers of adherents.

Charles Wesley, brother to John, when on a voyage to North America in 1735, made the acquaintance of some Herrnhuters, and was favorably impressed by their teaching and their practices. In the company of Spangenberg, he in 1738 visited several of their communities in Germany and Holland. He was powerfully impressed by the doctrine that after experiencing strong feelings on the subject, the conscious presence of divine grace, accompanied by a heavenly peace, would suddenly make itself felt in the soul. But it was not till May, 1739 (1738 ?), that he enjoyed this happy state himself; and since then this doctrine has been zealously preached. Numerous conversions, frequently accompanied by convulsions of

Digitized by Google

the body, took place. Anglican clergymen soon denounced the Methodists as eccentric enthusiasts and fanatics, for which cause the latter gradually separated themselves and formed a sect apart; John Wesley assuming the office of a bishop, ordaining ministers and appointing bishops.

For a time an intimate association existed between the Methodists and Herrnhuters, and they held meetings in common at London. But this union did not last long: apart from the personal rivalry of Wesley and Zinzendorf, there was a great discrepancy between the two sects in the teachings respecting the workings of grace and of regeneration.

Shortly after the Methodists themselves broke into a schism.[1] Wesley and Whitefield became divided in opinion; the latter adopted Calvin's views on predestination, the former those of Arminius. In this way arose Wesleyan Methodists and those following Whitefield, who carried on a bitter controversy with each other. Notwithstanding their aspirations after perfection, many Wesleyans fell into Antinomian principles and led frightfully immoral lives. Fletcher,[2] an ardent and active disciple of Wesley, drew special attention to the difference of principle between Wesley and Whitefield, thus widening the chasm. In 1771 a conference was held, at which John Wesley, who had been appalled at the advancement of immorality, took the lead as president. It was found that the cause of the disorder proceeded from the view that Christ had abolished the moral law.

As a general rule, the Methodists, especially the Wesleyans, continued to insist on the necessity of interior sanctification and perfection. They claimed to be in extraordinary communion with God, maintained that they had a divine mission and the gift of grace, rejected reasoning in matters of revelation, held their religious services mainly if not entirely in accordance with the liturgy of the English Establishment, and introduced immersion at baptism. The whole community received the Lord's Supper every Sunday; every Wednesday night a meeting of all the members took place; Saturday night was spent in teaching, singing, and praying. Every community was divided into classes, and these into bands; several communities formed a circuit, presided over by a superintendent; several cir-

[1] *R. Southey's* Life of John Wesley, etc. 2 vols. *T. Jackson*, History of the Commencement, Progress, and Present State of Methodism. London, 1838. *S. Warren*, Chronicles and Digest of Laws, etc., of Methodism. 2 vols. London, 1827.

[2] See *Fletcher's* Checks to Antinomianism, vol. ii. pp. 22, 200, 215.

Digitized by Google

cuits made a district. The annual conference formed the supreme governing body.

England, and still more America were the chief countries visited by the Methodists. Whitefield died at Newburyport in 1770. At the death of John Wesley in 1791, his system had in England three hundred and thirteen, and in North America one hundred and ninety-eight ecclesiastics, with on the whole about one hundred and thirty thousand adherents. He left numerous writings. The numbers of the Methodists continually increased, but so also did the schisms in the sect.

False spiritualism is developed in the most consecutive manner by the Quakers, or Friends.[1] George Fox, a cobbler, born at Drayton, a village of Leicestershire, in 1624 (+ 1691), a man of melancholy temperament, is generally recognized as the founder of the sect. Filled with interior light, he came forth in 1649 as a preacher, and gained adherents, who, however, on account of their wild fanaticism and senseless visionary ravings, were very hardly dealt with by the English Government. It was under James II. that they first received toleration, and under William III. that they attained religious freedom. In 1681 the Quakers came to America (Pennsylvania) under William Penn (+ 1718). The fundamental principle of their system is the doctrine of the inner light, or enlightenment from heaven, which is the cause of religious knowledge and the source of a pious life. It is from this light that the Holy Scriptures derive their authority and sense. Exterior worship, ecclesiastical ceremonies, the holy sacraments, are useless and superfluous. On this account the sect has no special order or class of preachers as administrators of the divine office of teaching, neither have they any defined liturgy. To the peculiarities of the Quakers, in which convulsions play no insignificant part, belong the omission of the usual signs of politeness, refusal to take an oath, to pay tithes, and to perform military service. A degree of moral earnestness is shown in the prohibition of certain games, of theatrical amusements, and of dancing. Music is also forbidden. The members of the Society who do not stringently live up to these rules are called "wet" Quakers; those who observe them strictly are termed "dry." Their chief theologian is Robert Barclay (+ 1690).

[1] *Robert Barclay*, Theologiae vere Christianae apologiae (2d ed.). London, 1729. *W. R. Wagstaff*, History of the Society of Friends. New York, 1836. *Möhler*, Symbolism, p. 568.

Digitized by Google

The doctrinal system of Emanuel Swedenborg[1] (1688–1772) is a singular mixture of rationalism and false mysticism. Emanuel was the son of Jesper Swedberg, the Lutheran titular bishop of Skara, in West Gothland. He professed to have received a call from God to restore original Christianity and to found the Church of the New Jerusalem. The doctrine of Swedenborg has an eminently practical bearing. He combated alike the Protestant doctrine of justification and Calvin's predestination. The Trinity is to him only a triple manifestation of the Godhead; he rejects the doctrine of the fall of man, and of original sin, together with the Christian idea of the resurrection. He treats the doctrine of redemption according to the interpretation of the Gnostics, and in particular denies the vicarious atonement of Christ. Of the sacraments he retains only baptism and the Lord's Supper. Like the ancient heretics, Swedenborg treats and interprets Holy Writ in an arbitrary fashion. Of the New Testament he accepts only the four Gospels and the Apocalypse. His followers were quite numerous; in Sweden they numbered about two thousand, and they spread to England, North America, France, and Würtemberg. Tafel of Tübingen is in the last-named country a special defender of his views; he is also the publisher of his fantastic writings.

The Baptists in England originated in 1608. They were independent of the Mennonites in Germany and Holland, but did not rise into importance before 1688. They administered baptism to adults only and by complete immersion, strictly adhered to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, kept holy the Sabbath day (Saturday) instead of Sunday, and frequently held Antinomian views. A community of Baptists was formed at New York in 1762, and their opinions spread rapidly in America, where their numbers increased, especially of that part of the sect which acknowledged free-will (1780).

Among the non-episcopal religious associations of England that of the Presbyterians had been the strongest; but in the eighteenth century it disappeared almost wholly, owing to change of doctrine among them. The most prominent theologians of this sect, Richard Baxter and Daniel Williams, had so clearly and convincingly proved the contradictions involved in the Calvinistic theory on justification and the detrimental effect it had on morals, that most congregations

[1] *Möhler's* Symbolism, p. 568. *Görres*, Swedenborg and his Relation to the Church. Strasburg, 1827.

Digitized by Google

gave up the doctrine and took to Arminianism, by which the spiritual bond was dissolved and the dismembering process begun. Others turned to Arianism, and thence naturally slid into the so-called Unitarianism, which holds Christ to be a man. The rationalistic tendency of this sect was more closely developed and defended by Lælius Socinus (+ 1562), a friend of Melanchthon.[1] It denies the fundamental articles of Christianity; namely, the Trinity, original sin, the redemption, the efficacy of the sacraments, etc. The Unitarians found admittance chiefly in Poland, where they received the name of Socinians from their chief leader, Faustus Socinus (+ 1604), the nephew of Lælius. Driven out of Poland, they found a refuge in Prussia and Transylvania. In the latter country Socinian communities still exist.[2]

§ 199. *Controversies on the Relation which Grace bears to Free-Will.*

The question as to how the efficacy of grace harmonizes with the freedom of the human will caused great disputations among Catholic theologians. Some laid so great a stress on grace that they seemed even to deny the freedom of the will, while others defended that free-will so strongly that they appeared to exclude the necessity of divine grace.

Michael Baius,[3] professor of theology at Louvain, belonged to the first class. He, like his colleague John Hessel, was an opponent of the scholastic method, for which they wanted to substitute the positive. The false assertions of Baius respecting the original state of man, the nature of original sin, the state of fallen man, and especially his opinions on free-will, good works, and their merits, were condemned by Pius V. in the bull "Ex omnibus afflictionibus" (Oct. 1, 1567), in seventy-nine articles.[4]

The adherents of Baius opposed the papal decision, which they sought to interpret in a way more favorable to themselves by chang-

[1] See *Trechsel*, Protestant Anti-Trinitarians before Faustus Socinus. 2 vols. Heidelberg, 1844.

[2] The Catechism of Rakau is a main source for this sect (1609). Catech. Racoviensis, ed. *Oeder*. Frankfort, 1739.

[3] *Baii*, Op. Colon. 1696. *Petavius*, De theolog. dogma, tom. iii. Conférence d'Angers sur la grâce. Paris, 1789. *Du Chesne*, Hist. du Bajanisme. Douay, 1731.

[4] Bullar. Rom. (ed. Taurin.) viii. 314 sqq. Edit. stereotyp. Conc. Trid. Lips. p. 273 sqq. Cf. *Denzinger*, Enchir. p. 302 sqq.

Digitized by Google

ing the punctuation;[1] and this caused Gregory XIII. (Jan. 29, 1579) to renew the sentence of his predecessor. Baius submitted, and died in peace with the Church, 1589.

The opponents of Baius were two Jesuits, Leonard Lessius and John Hamel (1587), whose views on the relation of grace to free-will went to the opposite extreme, and seemed to the Louvain professors to savor of Semi-Pelagianism. The theological faculty disclaimed thirty-four of the propositions drawn from the writings of the two above-named, and the University of Douay confirmed this decision. The Belgian bishops were divided in their opinions; and the Apostolic See, to whom the controversy was referred for decision, commanded both parties to await that decision, and meanwhile not to censure each other.

But before the Holy See had passed judgment on the matter, the controversy broke out anew in Spain. The doctrine of the Dominicans, of the "praedeterminatio" or "praemotia physica," whose chief defender was Bannez, gave offence to the Jesuits. It was assailed by Louis Molina, who, while fully recognizing the principle of the necessity of grace, placed the cause of its efficacy, not in the "praemotio," but in the free assent of the human will. He traced the infallible efficacy of grace back to the so-called mediate knowledge of God ("scientia Dei media"), as had been taught by Pedro Fonseca (1566), his master.

Molina's book was attacked by the Dominicans Alvarez and Thomas de Lemos, who accused him of Pelagianism. This induced the Jesuits to refer the said work to the Inquisition, which, at the command of Clement VIII., asked of the Dominicans and Jesuits theological explanations of the teaching of their schools, and also requested of the Spanish episcopate and of several universities and academies well-considered opinions on the contested points of teaching.

But in order to sift the whole controversy still more thoroughly, Pope Clement VIII., in 1597, established the celebrated congregation "De Auxiliis."[2] The majority of the "consulted," after mature

[1] At the end the Pope says: "Quas quidem sententias stricto coram nobis examine ponderatas, quanquam nonnullae aliquo pacto sustineri possent, in rigore et proprio verborum sensu ab assertoribus intento haereticas, erroneas, suspectas, temerarias, scandalosas, et in pias aures offensionem immittentes respective, ac quaecunque super iis verbo scriptoque emissa praesentium auctoritate damnamus." The adherents of Baius effaced the comma after "possent," and inserted one after "intento" (Comma Pianum).

[2] On its establishment and labors, see Historia congreg. de auxiliis, etc.

Digitized by Google

examination, decided against Molina's book. The Pope, however, ordered a new investigation, which was not brought to a close till the pontificate of his successor, Paul V. (1606); even then no definite decision ensued. The Apostolic See tolerated both systems, and forbade the adherents on both sides of the question to accuse each other of heresy.

In the mean time the system of Molina was modified by the Jesuits into so-called Congruism. This was afterwards expanded and developed by Suarez and Vasquez. According to them the efficacy of grace depends on its congruity ("gratia congrua et gratia incongrua"). This system, which is quite different from that of Molina, was in 1613 ordered to be taught in all the schools of the Jesuits by the general of the order, Claudius Aquaviva.[1]

§ 200. *Jansenism.*

Two pupils of the University of Louvain, Cornelius Jansenius, a professor of Louvain, afterwards Bishop of Ypern (+ 1638), and his somewhat visionary friend Du Verger de Hauranne, Abbot of St. Cyran (+ 1643), conceived the plan of framing an apology of the doctrines of Baius and of attacking the Jesuits. For this purpose Jansenius was to work out the dogmas, St. Cyran to write concerning the hierarchy.[2]

For twenty long years Jansenius labored at his work, that made its first appearance after his death in 1640, under the title of "Augustinus;"[3] but it reproduced, not the doctrine of the Bishop of Hippo, as the author announced it was to do, but rather the errors of Calvin, inasmuch as Jansenius, with a glaring misapprehension

[1] By him the Order of Studies, "Ratio studiorum" (Institut. Societat. Jesu: Prague, 1757), was drawn up and introduced, 1584.

[2] *Leydecker*, Hist. Jans. Traj. ad Rh. 1695. *Luchesini*, Hist. polem. Jans. 3 vols Rom. 1711. The various writings for and against Jansenists are to be found in *Roskovány*, l. c. ii. 757 sqq. Mémoires du P. Réné Rapin sur l'église, etc. 1644–1669, publiés pour la première fois par L. Aubineau. 3 vols. Paris, 1865. *Rapin*, Hist. du Jansénisme, ouvrage complètement inédit; revu et publié par l'abbé Domenech. Paris, 1865.

[3] Augustinus, seu doctrina S. Aug. de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina adv. Pelagianos et Massilienses, tribus tomis comprehensa. Lovan, 1640. St. Cyran wrote under the name Aurelius: op. ed. Paris, 1646. Respecting the so-called learned assembly at Bourg-Fontaine (1622), at which St. Cyran, Jansenius, and others projected a formal conspiracy against Christianity, and are said to have taken counsel together as to how to accomplish its overthrow, see La réalité du project de Bourg-Fontaine. 2 vols. Paris, 1756 sqq.

Digitized by Google

of what constitutes the natural and the supernatural, as also of the state of man before and after the fall into sin, denies to man in his fallen nature free-will ("liberum arbitrium"), and maintains that fallen man must follow of necessity the "delectatio carnalis" (concupiscence) or the "delectatio coelestis" (the holy love of God), according as this or that relatively obtains the victory ("relative victrix").

As the chief opponents of these errors, the Jesuits of Louvain came forward; they extracted several false propositions from the "Augustinus," and laid them before the Apostolic See for examination. On this, Pope Urban VIII., in the bull "In eminenti," forbade the book (March 6, 1642).

But the contest was not therefore at an end; on the contrary, it was now first carried on with great vehemence in France, where the "Augustinus" was widely diffused, and found opponents as well as eager defenders. To this last class belong Anthony Arnauld, Doctor of the Sorbonne (+ 1694), Pascal[1] (+ 1663), Nicole (+ 1695), and others.

These controversies caused eighty-eight French bishops, in the year 1650, to lay five propositions drawn from the "Augustinus" before the Apostolic See, by the hand of the Syndic Cornet, that the Pope might pronounce judgment upon them. After mature examination, Pope Innocent X. rejected as false and heretical five propositions, taken from the work of Jansenius, in the bull "Cum occasione," which he issued May 31, 1653.[2]

As these five propositions, which Bossuet rightly characterizes as the soul of the Jansenistic system, did not all stand in "Augustinus" word for word as they were expressed in the document laid before the Pope, the Jansenists thought to evade the papal censures by

[1] Œuvres de Pascal, nouvelle éd. 5 vols. Paris, 1819. The most valuable work of Pascal is his "Pensées sur la religion," which is a splendid apology for the Church.

[2] Bullar. Rom. xv. 720 sqq. Ed. stereotyp. Conc. Trid. p. 278 sqq. The five propositions are worded thus: "(1) Aliqua Dei praecepta hominibus justis volentibus et conantibus, secundum praesentes quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia; deest quoque illis gratia, qua possibilia fiant. (2) Interiori gratiae in statu naturae lapsae nunquam resistitur. (3) Ad merendum et demerendum in statu naturae lapsae non requiritur in homine libertas a necessitate, sed sufficit libertas a coactione. (4) Semipelagiani admittebant praevenientis gratiae interioris necessitatem ad singulos actus, etiam ad initium fidei, et in hoc erant haeretici, quod vellent eam gratiam talem esse, cui posset humana voluntas resistere vel obtemperare. (5) Semipelagianum est dicere Christum pro omnibus omnino hominibus mortuum esse aut sanguinem fudisse." *Dumas*, His. de cinq. propos. de Jans. Trevoux, 1702.

Digitized by Google

asserting that the five rejected propositions are certainly heretical, but they are not in Jansenius, or at least he did not teach them in the sense in which they were condemned. On this an assembly of thirty-eight French bishops declared (March 28, 1654) that the five propositions under censure were really contained in the work of Jansenius; and the Pope confirmed this judgment in a special brief (Sept. 29, 1654).

Even this did not adjust the strife; for the Jansenists, who had been joined by the nuns of Port-Royal-des-Champs (in-the-fields), under their abbess Angelica Arnauld, now started a distinction between the question of the right and that of the fact ("quaestio juris et facti"); and they maintained that the Church is certainly infallible when she rejects an opinion as heretical, but she cannot with infallible certainty determine that the propositions she rejects as erroneous are to be found in the book of a certain author. Therefore to her expression concerning facts only a reverential silence is required ("silentium obsequiosum").

This false distinction, which Pascal specially defends in his provincial letters, Alexander VII. rejected (Oct. 16, 1656) in the bull "Ad sanctam," and (Feb. 15, 1665) caused a formulary to be laid before the French clergy, in which each one was required to reject the five propositions contained in the "Augustinus," as they had been condemned by the Apostolic See.

The pernicious contest was now laid to rest for a long time, till in the year 1702 the Case of Conscience invented by the Jansenists was brought forward; this recalled it into existence, and indeed in such a manner that the Constitution of Clement XI., "Vineam Domini" (July 16, 1705), could not again restore tranquillity.

The most zealous defenders of Jansenistic errors in France were the hyper-rigoristic "Hermits" in the neighborhood of Port-Royal-des-Champs. They, by their severe practices of penance,[1] and above all by discouraging the frequent reception of Holy Communion, worked unspeakable mischief among the people. Encouraged by these Hermits, alike through word and example, even the nuns of Port-Royal, whose reputation for piety was of the highest character, refused to submit themselves in an unqualified manner to the decision of the Church, which refusal after a long contest finally resulted in the suppression and destruction of their abbey in 1710.

[1] *Petavius* wrote against Arnauld. "De la pénitence publique," etc. Paris, 1644.

Digitized by Google

§ 201. *Jansenism (continued).* — *Quesnel.*

A new act of the Jansenistic drama began with the censure of the "Moral Reflections" of the Oratorian[1] Paschasius Quesnel, who under a very artful disguise sought to disseminate the Gallican errors and those of Jansenius. The first edition of this spiritual book, so full of unction, appeared in 1671 at Paris,[2] and found a very favorable reception. Several bishops recommended the book to their diocesans.

On account of his predilection for Jansenism, Quesnel in the year 1684 was expelled from the Oratorian Community, and took up his residence in Brussels, to which place Anthony Arnauld had withdrawn in 1679. Encouraged by him, Quesnel in the subsequent editions of his works (1687–1692) gave freer utterance to his views, and without disguise expressed his Jansenistic errors. This occasioned many learned men of note to express disapproval of the "Moral Reflections," although Louis Anthony of Noailles, in 1680 Bishop of Châlons, and from Aug. 19, 1695, Archbishop of Paris, who in 1700 was created cardinal, had renewed his approval of the book on July 20, 1695.

The strife had spread over a large territory when in the year 1703 some French bishops forbade the book. The question in dispute was brought before the Holy See, and Pope Clement XI. in a brief of 1708 rejected the errors of the "Moral Reflections." As this papal decision, however, did not bring the contest to an end, Clement XI., after a renewed and close examination of the "Moral Reflections," issued (Sept. 8, 1713) the celebrated bull "Unigenitus,"[3]

[1] On the influence of Jansenistic views on the members of the communities of St. Maur and of the Oratory, see *Fénelon*, Memoriale Sanctissimo Dom. n. clam legendum (Œuvres, éd. Paris, 1850), tom. iv. p. 452 sqq.

[2] It appeared under the title "Abrégé de la morale de l'Évangile ou pensées chrétiennes sur le texte des quatres Évangiles," Paris, 1671, in duodecimo, and had the approbation of Bishop Vialard of Châlons.

[3] Bullar. Rom. xxi. 568 sqq. (ed. Taurin.). *Lafiteau*, Histoire de la constit. Unigenit., 3 vols., Paris, 1737 (ital. by Nucci Rom. 1794), and La vie de Clem. XI. 2 vols. *Fontaine*, Constitutio Unigenitus theologice propugnata. Dillingae, 1720. Schill. The Constit. Unigenitus; the Occasion of it, and its Consequences. Freib. 1876. A mass of writings, great and small, appeared against the bull. Bauer (p. 32) considers the writing *Frickius*, Inclementia Clementia examinata, h. e. Bulla Clem. XI. papae, etc., Ulmae, 1719, to be the work of a Jansenist rather than that of a Protestant. Respecting the fate of the bull and the reception of it by the Catholics of the whole world, see Témoignage de l'église universelle en faveur de la bulle Unigenitus à Bruxelles, 1718. Schill. p. 317 sqq.

Digitized by Google

which condemned one hundred and one propositions extracted from the work of Quesnel, as heretical, scandalous, etc.

Most of the French bishops, and the Sorbonne in 1714, accepted the bull unconditionally; but a few prelates refused to receive it, although with one exception they forbade the censured book. To the last-named belonged Cardinal Noailles, whose resistance was not to be overcome either by the Pope or by King Louis XIV.

Under the regency of the dissolute Philip, Duke of Orleans, the strife still continued, and took quite a formidable character. The French clergy were divided into two classes or parties, — some calling themselves Acceptants, the others Appellants; the Acceptants were such clergymen as accepted the bull "Unigenitus," and the Appellants were those who appealed from the decision of the Apostolic See to an œcumenical council. The confusion which this caused was increased to a still higher degree when Cardinal Noailles, at first secretly and then publicly, joined the Appellants, and with him the Sorbonne, although by so doing the members were in contradiction with their earlier decision. Attempts made to reconcile the parties failed. Clement XI., at length, in his bull "Pastoralis officii" (1718), threatened the disobedient with the censures of the Church. It was not till Oct. 11, 1727, that Cardinal Noailles (+ May 4, 1729) accepted the bull "Unigenitus." In 1729 the Sorbonne followed his example, and other Jansenist-minded clergymen soon after did the same.[1]

The Jansenists proper, however, who poured forth the most outrageous insults against the papal bull and the Apostolic See, continued their opposition, and when they had lost their chief defenders, took refuge in the simulated miracles of the Deacon Francis of Paris, an Appellant (+ 1727), whose bones repose in the cemetery of St. Médard. The Archbishop de Vintimille of Paris and other bishops asserted that the alleged cures were fictitious, and in 1732 the Government closed the cemetery. But the same scenes were now enacted in private houses, which gave rise to so

[1] The bishops of Montpellier, Auxerre, Troyes, and Bishop Soanen (+ 1740) of Senez, remained obstinate. On Aug. 28, 1728, Bishop Soanen issued another pastoral letter against the bull "Unigenitus," which he asserted destroyed dogma, morality, discipline, and the hierarchy. On June 15, 1727, his Metropolitan Archbishop Tencin of Embrun summoned a provincial synod, by whom Bishop Soanen was suspended on account of his pastoral letter. Cf. Collectio Lacensis, i. 615 sqq. Twelve French bishops protested against this decision, among whom was Cardinal Noailles. Louis XV. refused to hear them; on which nine of them appealed to Parliament on May 7, 1728.

Digitized by Google

many scandalous enormities that many Appellants publicly disclaimed this mode of proceeding; their doing so caused another split among the Jansenists, — the Convulsionaries and anti-Convulsionaries. The revolutionary parliaments, which took the Convulsionaries under their protection, and sought to compel the Catholic clergy to administer the sacraments to dying Appellants, hindered the complete dissolution of the schismatic party; while the conduct of the court, which was a singular mixture of despotism and undignified weakness, only strengthened the disobedient still more in their obduracy.

It was in vain that Pope Benedict XIV. endeavored, through the brief "Ex omnibus," in 1756, to give peace to the much-afflicted Church of France, which had been fearfully distracted and laid waste by Jansenism. It was not till the French Revolution that this sadly pernicious heresy came to an end, and even then all its erroneous principles were not destroyed.

§ 202. *The Schism of Utrecht.*

Outside of France, the Jansenists principally found adherents in the Netherlands, where they found themselves able even to organize a society for their schism, the history of which is as follows:[1] —

The Vicar Apostolic Peter Codde,[2] a Jansenist, refused to subscribe the formulary of Alexander VII., and this drew upon him suspension in the time of Clement XI. (1702), and Theodore von Kock was named pro-vicar in his stead. But he, as well as his successor, met with violent opposition from the States General, as also from the vicariate of Utrecht, acting under the influence of Quesnel, which vicariate also refused to subscribe the formulary, and at a later date would not receive the bull "Unigenitus," and appealed to an œcumenical council. The schism was completed by the vicariate of Utrecht declaring itself to be the cathedral chapter, and in the year 1723 electing Cornelius Stenhoven as archbishop; he was consecrated on Oct. 15, 1724, by the suspended titular bishop

[1] *Hoynk van Papendrecht*, Hist. de rebus eccl. Ultraject. Colon. 1725. *Mozzi*, Storia delle revoluzioni della Chiesa d' Utrecht. 3 vols. Venez. 1787. See *Bauer* in "Voices from Maria Laach," i. 376 sqq.

[2] The separation of the Netherlands from Spain was followed by the dissolution of the bishoprics and of the cathedral chapter, with the exception of the chapter of Haarlem and Utrecht. The Catholics of Holland were placed under a vicar apostolic.

Digitized by Google

of Babylon, Dominic Varlet, a partisan of Jansenism. The schismatic party then applied for the confirmation by the Holy See of Stenhoven's election, but in 1725 Benedict XIII. refused to ratify the uncanonical proceeding. In spite of this, after the death of Stenhoven (April 3, 1725), the schismatics proceeded to the election of a new archbishop, who was recognized by the Apostolic See as little as the former one had been. In order to maintain the schism, Archbishop Meindarts nominated two suffragan bishops, — one for Haarlem in 1742, to whom the cathedral chapter of that place refused obedience; and one for Deventer in 1757, whom the chapter also rejected. On Sept. 13, 1763, the schismatic bishops held a pseudo-synod in Utrecht, at which three bishops, six canonists, and nine parish priests were present; here the parish priests had also deciding votes. Clement XIII., on April 30, 1765, rejected the resolutions. The schism now numbers about six thousand adherents. Lately these schismatics have fraternized with the so-called Old Catholics.

§ 203. *Quietism.*

The errors of the false mysticism of the Alombrados (the "overshadowed" of the seventeenth century) in Spain had been suppressed by the Inquisition; yet they soon reappeared in Rome, and there found a defender in the person of the Spanish priest Michael de Molinos, who in his "Spiritual Guide," in 1675, and in other writings gave utterance to views as intricate and confused as they were injurious to morals.

According to Molinos, the highest degree of perfection which the soul can attain consists in the annihilation of the various powers with which it is endowed, and in a total absorption in God, during which it abstains from all activity, neither desires heaven nor fears hell, neither awakens any act of faith nor offers any particular prayer, renounces hope alike with fear, affords no resistance to temptation, but, abandoning itself to its nothingness, keeps itself absolutely passive, that God may alone work out his will in it, etc.

As the result of such teaching in Rome was the formation of conventicles of false mysticism, the Apostolic See had Molinos's writings examined more closely, and in 1687 Pope Innocent XI. rejected sixty-eight propositions extracted from them.[1] The author

[1] *Denzinger*, Enchir. p. 333 sqq. The Jesuit Segneri was the first to oppose Molinos, which he did in his "Concordantia laboris cum quiete in oratione."

Digitized by Google

submitted,[1] and remained imprisoned in a monastery until his death in 1696.

The spiritualism of the pious widow Joanna de la Mothe Guyon differs from these errors, although it is also erroneous. Madame Guyon was a disciple of the Barnabite La Combe, whose mystical writings contain erring views on what constitutes "pure love," on contemplative prayer, etc. The Archbishop of Paris, Francis de Harlay, and the Bishop of Chartres, condemned these writings; and the Conference at Issy, summoned by Louis XIV. (1694 and 1695), explained in thirty-four articles the principles of genuine mysticism in opposition to those of a false spiritualism and quietism. Madame Guyon subscribed these articles without demur, and from that time forth took up her residence in St. Cyr (+ 1717).

But this did not end the matter in dispute. Bossuet's treatise "On the States of Prayer,"[2] caused Fénelon to publish a work on "The Maxims of the Saints concerning the Interior Life." On this a vehement controversy began between the two illustrious prelates. The question in dispute was at length referred for decision to the Apostolic See; and on March 12, 1699, Innocent XII. rejected twenty-three propositions[3] taken from Fénelon's writing. The pious archbishop submitted unconditionally to the papal decision.

§ 204. *The Religious Condition of Germany after the Peace of Westphalia.—Several Attempts at Union.*

In spite of the Peace of Westphalia contentions between Catholics and Protestants still continued, especially in the territories inhabited by a mixed population, and often formed the theme of discussion in the diet.

The spirit which the Protestants cherished towards the Catholics may be judged by the continued opposition made by them to the introduction of the Gregorian Calendar. It was still more strikingly

[1] See Breve relatione dell' Abjura del Dottor Molinos e suoi seguaci seguita li 3 e 4 Settembre, 1687, in *Laemmer*, Melemetematum Rom. mantissa, p. 407 sqq.

[2] Sur les états d'oraison. Bossuet sent the manuscript to Archbishop Fénelon for his approval, which the latter refused to give. The treatise first appeared in print after Fénelon's "Explication des maximes des Saints sur la vie intérieure." Cf. *Bossuet*, Hist. de Fénelon, lib. ii. 1 sqq. Hist. de Bossuet, lib. x. 5 sqq.

[3] *Denzinger*, Enchir. p. 348 sqq. The doctrine of perfect and imperfect love is treated in a very lucid manner in *Deharbe*, The Perfect Love of God, etc. Ratisbon, 1856.

Digitized by Google

manifested at the second centenary celebration of the so-called Reformation in 1717, in which the most hateful attacks were made on the Catholic Church. John Nicholas Weislinger (+1755) and others, in undertaking the defence of it, also used very sharp and acrimonious expressions.

The emigration from Salzburg in 1731 was also used by Protestant writers to cast obloquy on the character of the Archbishop Leopold Anthony of Firmian, while it was in fact King Frederic William I. of Prussia, together with the other Protestant States, who deserves the severe reproach of having, under the cloak of religion, fanned the flames of revolt, in order to people his own province of Lithuania, which had been depopulated by the plague, with the peasants who thus emigrated from their own homes.[1]

Mixed marriages between Catholics and those who belonged to the Lutheran or Reformed confession became in the eighteenth century another source of discord.[2]

The efforts made by Protestant theologians and princes to establish harmony between Lutherans and Calvinists met with no success. The "Irenicum" of the Heidelberg Professor Paräus was rejected by the Lutherans. The conference between Lutheran and Calvinistic theologians called together by Gustavus Adolphus at Leipsic in 1631, and the colloquy which took place at Cassel ("Unio conservativa") in 1661, passed away without result. The proposal of Professor Pfaff of Tübingen, in 1720, that each should bear patiently with the other's opinions met with no practical response.

Notwithstanding the fruitlessness of the efforts hitherto made to reconcile Protestant parties with the Catholic Church, this project was again renewed in the seventeenth century. John Philip von Schönborn, Archbishop of Mentz, interested himself more particularly in this project of union, in forwarding which his minister, Count Boineburg, and others, displayed a great amount of zeal and energy, without, however, attaining the object in view.

Christopher Royas (Roxas) de Spinola, Bishop of Tina in Croatia, and later of Vienna Neustadt, who, commissioned by the Emperor Leopold I. in 1675, visited several Protestant courts to win them over to the union, met with no better success. He was only listened to in Hanover. The conference appointed by the Duke Ernest Augustus, in which the Protestant Abbot Gerhard Molanus von

[1] The number of the emigrants amounted to twenty thousand. One part of these settled in England and America (Georgia).

[2] See the papal decisions in these cases in *Roskovány*, De matr. mixtis, tom. ii.

Digitized by Google

Loccum, the court chaplain Barkhausen, and some professors from Helmstädt took part, expressed in a memorial[1] their opinion that the Protestants should submit to the Pope, but first desired that the differences in the articles of faith should remain unadjusted until an œcumenical council be convoked in which the Protestant superintendents should have places and votes, and in which these differences should then be decided.

Spinola agreed to this, and betook himself to Rome to obtain the assent of the Holy See. Pope Innocent XI. praised the zeal of the bishop, and commissioned him *henceforward* to work in his (the Pope's) name for the union, but without committing himself to a specific declaration on the proposals of the bishop.

Manifestly the apologetic means of union used by Spinola was very inappropriate to its object, since a true and sincere reunion of Protestants with the Catholic Church can only be founded on unity of belief.

The celebrated Leibnitz gave utterance to this conviction plainly and distinctly in the presence of Duke Ernest Augustus and Molanus; he even wrote a special treatise, "Systema theologicum,"[2] in which he laid down the grounds on which a treaty of union could be carried out. Bossuet also, to whom the memorial had been communicated by the Duchess Sophia in 1683, explained, in a letter to Madame de Brinon in 1699, that the Catholic Church might indeed yield in matters of indifference and in things appertaining to discipline alone, but never could she waver in a single item of her firmly rooted doctrine, and especially in those decreed by the Council of Trent. The learned abbot of Loccum followed Bossuet's plan, and wrote his "Private Thoughts" on the points of faith in dispute. Bossuet answered through his "Reflections." On this, Molanus composed a treatise embracing a wider range, in which he made still greater concessions; but at the same time, in obedience to a hint he had received from the court, he demanded that the Council of Trent should be set aside.

[1] "Methodus reducendae unionis ecclesiasticae inter Romanenses et Protestantes," committed to writing by Molanus and Barkhausen; according to which the "Regula circa Christianorum omnium ecclesiasticam unionem" was agreed upon between Spinola and Molanus. It is printed in *Bossuet*, Œuvres compl. (Paris, 1846), viii. 509 sqq.

[2] This treatise lay hidden for a whole century: and it was not till 1819 that it was published in Latin and French at Paris, in Latin and in German by *Räsz* and *Weis*, Mentz, 1820, and edited by Haas, Tübingen, 1860.

Digitized by Google

Guided by a sincere desire for peace, Bossuet and Molanus had already come to an understanding on several weighty points, when suddenly affairs took a different turn. The negotiations were not indeed altogether broken off, out of respect for the emperor, who in 1692 had conferred on Duke Ernest Augustus the ninth electoral dignity; but the duke desired a mere exterior union, and his zeal grew cold in the same proportion as the prospects of his wife to ascend the throne of England grew more favorable. The electoral princess Sophia, who was his wife, was a granddaughter of James I., and presumptive heiress to the English throne after the death of Queen Anne, since Parliament had excluded all Catholics from the succession.

This change of sentiment made itself felt in all the further transactions. Molanus was kept at a distance; Leibnitz stepped into his place. As the interpreter of his court, the great philosopher took a stand in his conferences with the successor of Spinola (+ 1695), the Count of Buchheim, as well as in his correspondence with Bossuet, which was quite foreign to his real convictions.

But apart from the consideration of these important circumstances, Leibnitz and Bossuet started from principles diametrically opposed to each other. The device of the Bishop of Meaux was, "Credo, ut intelligam" ("I believe, in order to understand"); that of the philosopher found expression in the proposition "Intelligo, ut credam" ("I know, in order to believe"). Under these circumstances, the correspondence between Leibnitz and Bossuet after the death of the historian Pellison was to remain fruitless.

Compelled thereto by the false standpoint he had taken, Leibnitz played the part of a controversialist, and brought forward, at times not without personal excitement, the most varying objections to the Council of Trent; while Bossuet, standing firmly on the principles of peace, repelled the attacks of the acute philosopher, and to his subjectivity held up before him the objectivity of faith of the infallible Church. In 1694 Bossuet, convinced of the fruitlessness of his labors, broke off the correspondence with Leibnitz.

But the latter again seized the pen; and again it was the authority of the council, and especially the decree concerning the so-called deutero-canonical books, that was the object of the controversy. Bossuet very shrewdly refuted all the objections brought forward against this decree. This ended the controversy; Leibnitz replied no more.

Such was the course taken in the correspondence, so interesting

Digitized by Google

in many respects, between the two great thinkers,—a course which leaves an incontestable proof that only in the recognition of the teaching office of the Church is it possible to attain a true and lasting union with her.

It was with this conviction that many princely persons, statesmen, and learned doctors were filled, who in the course of time made their way back to the Church; while those men who set up their subjective measures in the place of the divine teaching authority of the Church, with all their Catholicizing views and expressions, advanced but to the threshold of the Church, without crossing the boundary and entering within the structure.

§ 205. *The Græco-Russian Church.—Attempts at Union.—The Older Sects of the East.*

After the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, the schismatic Greek Church became utterly subject to the Sultans, who permitted indeed the ancient hierarchical constitution to remain, and the exercise of their worship to take place, but under very oppressive conditions, as they allowed themselves to interfere in the most encroaching manner with the interior regulations of the Church, and made the election of the Patriarch of Constantinople a rich source of gain to themselves, deposing or replacing him according to their own caprice.[1]

No long time had elapsed, after the Church split in Germany, before the followers of Luther sought to win the Greek schismatics to the cause of their heresy. As early as 1559 Melanchthon sent to the Patriarch Joasaph of Constantinople, a Greek translation of the Augsburg Confession, with a very artful letter to accompany it. The patriarch, however, saw through the hypocrite, and returned him no answer. The professors of Tübingen, James Andreä, Crusius, and others, who had entered into correspondence with the Patriarch Jeremias, fared no better; for he refuted their Augsburg Confession, and admonished them to forsake their errors and to give him no further annoyance (*ἀπηλλάξατε τῶν φροντίδων ἡμᾶς*).

The Calvinists, however, thought that they might promise themselves better results when Cyril Lukaris, who had been Patriarch of Alexandria from the year 1602, succeeded in becoming Patriarch of Constantinople in 1621. Through his connection with the reformed

[1] *Le Quien*, Oriens Christ. 3 vols. fol. Paris, 1740.

Digitized by Google

theologians of Geneva, Cyril had become acquainted with Calvinism, which he now sought to spread by the help of English and Dutch ambassadors; but this attempt also failed.

The patriarch (+1638), who fiercely persecuted the Latins, especially the Jesuits, excited the deepest indignation among the Greeks by his Calvinistic profession of faith. Several synods[1] were held expressly to proclaim the doctrine of transubstantiation (*μετουσιοῦσθαι*) in a decisive manner, and to reject with contempt Calvinistic predestination as a blasphemous heresy (*βέβηλον καὶ ἀνόσιον*).

Count Zinzendorf, who in 1737 wanted to make a Herrnhuter of the patriarch of Constantinople, met with no better success than his predecessors.

Unhappily, the schismatic Greeks obstinately rejected all the admonitions of the Pope that they should return to unity with the Church. The negotiations of the papal legate Possevin with the Czar Iwan IV. (1533–1584) led to no result; yet in 1595 a union of those Russian provinces which had been taken by the Poles was effected at the Synod of Brest under the Metropolitan Rahosa.

Ever since the sixteenth century the Russian rulers have been striving to establish a national Church independent of Constantinople; in this they were aided by the weakness and poverty of the patriarch of Constantinople. In 1448 the Metropolitan of Moscow was already acknowledged by the Russian bishops as the Metropolitan of all Russia, and in 1588 Patriarch Jeremias of Constantinople raised the metropolitan of the above-named city to the Patriarchate of Russia, reserving to himself only the ratification of the patriarch appointed; and even this reservation was, after the year 1660, not insisted on. The patriarchs of Constantinople made no further opposition, and approved or at least accepted the changes which Peter the Great made in the government of the Church;[2] chiefly, the abolition of the patriarchate, and the establishment of the "Holy Synod" (1721), whose decisions have to be ratified by the emperor.

[1] Two synods in Constantinople, in 1638 and 1642, and a synod in Jerusalem, 1672, under Patriarch Dositheus. The acts are in *Harduin*, Acta conc. xi. 179 sqq. *Schelstrate*, l. c. p. 466 sqq. *Kimmel*, l. c. p. 325. The Confession of the schismatic metropolitan of Kiew attained great authority (*Kimmel*, l. c. p. 56 sqq.), which the Synod of Jerusalem approved in 1672.

[2] Cf. Règlement ecclésiastique de Pierre le grand, traduit en français sur le russe, avec introduction et note par [illegible], Barnabite. Paris, 1874.

Digitized by Google

Any special desire for union with Rome, Peter the Great could scarcely have had, although many acts of his government look that way.

Among the various sects of the Russian State Church the most numerous are the so-called Raskolniks (Separatists), or, as they style themselves, Starowierzi (that is, men of the old faith). The origin of this sect, the members of which are again subdivided into various parties, falls in the year 1660. The occasion of it was the revision of the translations of the Bible and liturgical books undertaken by the Patriarch Nikon.

Of the other Oriental sects, some have become reconciled to Rome. The Nestorians were under the two patriarchs of Mosul (Mesopotamia) and of Ormia (Persia). Since 1780 they have only one patriarch. A part of them returned to the Church. In the second half of the sixteenth century the Monothelite Maronites of Lebanon also united themselves to the Apostolic See. A number of the Monophysite Armenians did the same. But the union of the Abyssinian Copts with the Church was not a lasting one.

§ 206. *Attacks upon Christianity. — English Deists. — Freemasons. — Philosophers in France.*

The mutiny of the so-called reformers against the divine authority of the Church included the natural inference, on their part, that they had a right to make their own doctrinal opinions an object of critical investigation; and this at an early date called forth opposition, which was increased by the arbitrary proceedings of princes, who, having received the protectorate of the New Gospel, sought to render the religious movement subservient to their own wishes and interests by the employment of physical force.

The opposition of the human intellect, thus injured and debased in its rights, did not stop at making head against the new churches set up by the Government, but broke through the prescribed limits and went on its way, combating the Protestant Proteus until it came to take up a position hostile to every positive religion.[1]

The combat against Christianity first broke out in England, where grossly irreligious tendencies had prevailed since the time of Crom-

[1] *Binder*, History of the Philosophical and Revolutionary Age in regard to the Condition of Catholicity. 2 vols. Schaffhausen, 1844.

Digitized by Google

well. The natural sciences were used to defy and destroy the doctrines of the Christian religion. Bacon, Baron of Verulam (+ 1626), had already by his inductive method ("Interpretatio naturae") laid the seed of empiricism. Lord Edward Herbert of Cherbury (+ 1648) went further yet. He comprised the whole contents of true religion in five points, questioned the supernatural character of Christianity, and set up natural religion instead of the revealed. To believe in God, to serve him by living a virtuous life, to be penitent for sins, to be persuaded of a future recompense for good and evil deeds, — such, according to his doctrine, are the conditions quite sufficient for salvation. Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury (+ 1679), tutor of Charles II., an advocate of absolute monarchy, edited (1646) at Paris his "Elementa philosophica de cive." He classed the ideas of Church and State under one identity, as meaning one and the same thing; ascribed to the ruler of the country the right to prescribe the faith and to change it at his pleasure; and asserted that the Holy Scriptures and the dogmas of Christianity have authority *only* in the degree in which they are recognized by the supreme ruler of the State. According to his view, religion is but a human invention, — a useful tool in the hands of the king, by which to rule the masses.

John Locke (+ 1704) built his philosophical system of sensation and empiricism on the basis of the deism and rationalism inaugurated by René Descartes (Cartesius, + 1650). Locke had lived for a time in the Netherlands, and had returned to England after the fall of the Stuarts. He asserts that nothing is in the intellect which was not previously recognized by the senses; of the New Testament he asserted that only the faith in Jesus as the Messias is absolutely necessary; that the power of the State is the mere work of man, founded on a free agreement of civil society. Though not personally an enemy to Christianity, he contributed not a little to undermine it by means of his disciples, who carried out the principles of their master to their logical results. It was chiefly Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury (+ 1713), who by his frivolous and sarcastic writings effected great damage to religion among the higher circles. Separating morality from religion, he declared that faith in God is powerless in the promotion of good morals, and made the motives for the beautiful and good entirely dependent on the interior voice of mankind. With sharp, satirical irony he sought to divest Holy Scripture of its divine character. He cast ridicule on the dogmas of faith, and proclaimed positive

Digitized by Google

religion to be a fraud, to which we should outwardly adhere in order to hold the great body of the superstitious people in check. William Lyons (+ 1713) contested the existence of supernatural revelation, and proclaimed true religion to be that of the infallible human reason. The Irish apostate Toland (+ 1721 or 1722), the head of the "Free-thinkers," who on behalf of enlightenment visited several courts, declared reason to be the only source of certainty and conviction, and was especially intent on supplanting Christianity by his own pantheistic system. The same principles were urged by Anthony Collins (+ 1729), a friend and pupil of Locke. He introduced the name "free-thinker." From being at first only an adversary of the Established Church, he finally directed his attacks against Christianity itself. At the suggestion of the Encyclopædists, his writings were translated into French.

Like Collins, Thomas Woolston (+ 1731)[1] declared the miracles of Christ to be mere allegories, and maintained that Christ and the Apostles had taught only the law and the religion of Nature. Matthew Tindal, a doctor of laws (+ 1733),[2] accepted but one religion as true, — that is, the natural religion, — and ascribed truth to Christianity only in the measure in which it agreed with this natural religion. Madeville (+ 1753), Morgan (+ 1743), and others wrote in a similar way. The philosopher Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, born in Ireland (+ 1753), who united with Locke, developed scepticism in his "Treatise on the Principles of Human Knowledge." His theory denied the existence of the material world, and reduced all matter to an absolute idealism.

The naturalistic, pantheistic errors of Chubb (+ 1747) were worked out for the lower classes. This man had risen from the trade of soap-boiler to the rank of a philosopher. Meanwhile Harry, Baron St. John Lidyard, Viscount Bolingbroke (+ 1751), wrote for the higher ranks. This profligate, who held the office of a cabinet minister in the reign of Queen Anne, undermined religion and morality, as much by the shamelessness of his course of life as by his witty, satirical, and not over-decent writings. He set up selfish-

[1] He wrote "The Old Apology of the Truth of the Christian Religion against the Jews and Gentiles Revived, London, 1696;" and "Discourses [six] on the Miracles of Christ." To the latter writing no less than sixty answers were given. (See *Chambers's* Encyclopædia.)

[2] Rights of the Christian Church asserted against the Romish and all other Priests who claim an Independent Power over it, etc. Christianity as Old as the Creation; or, The Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature.

Digitized by Google

ness as the highest motive of action; and in his letters on the study of history he distorts the objective character of this branch of learning, and brings it down to the level of a romance. On the same principle he handles the Holy Scriptures, seeking to place their narratives in the light of fraudulent fables, etc. The historian David Hume (+ 1776), an indifferentist and sceptic, derives monotheism from polytheism, and maintains that "doubt" is the result of all investigation of religion; he contests the miracles of Christ, and defends suicide. Yet about this time the Free-thinkers began to meet with less favor in England; a considerable reaction had taken place, in consequence of which the open attacks on Christianity were fewer in number.

The English Free-thinkers gradually withdrew from open manifestation into secret societies,[1] principally into the lodges of the Freemasons, to which most of the infidel writers, such as Toland, belonged. The Great Lodge (the first) was opened in London, 1717. As early as 1721 they numbered three hundred Freemasons. As early as 1728 there was in Bengal a provincial grand-master. In 1729 lodges were formed in Ireland and Scotland; in 1731, in North America; in 1733, in Hamburg; then in other cities. In Paris a lodge was established in 1725.

In 1731 the Grand Duke Francis Stephen of Tuscany was received into the society; then followed, in 1733, the Crown Prince Frederic of Prussia; and in 1737 the Prince of Wales also became a member. The society spread to the most distant lands. To the mother-lodges numerous others were affiliated. Although the discovery that over the lower symbolic degrees (apprentice, fellow, master) many higher grades existed, and that the supreme direction and the action of the league were shrouded in impenetrable mystery and guarded by terrible oaths, cast a slight check upon it, nevertheless the dangerous secret association spread, receiving into its bosom adherents of every creed, while giving prominence in its own circle to the worship of the "Great Architect of the Universe" alone. Nor did the prohibitions of the Holy See (§ 192) and of the courts of Vienna (1743, 1764), of Heidelberg (1737), of Madrid and Naples (1751), stop its course.

If the princes themselves were against it, still the most powerful ministers were protectors and favorers of the association, which, starting from England, proposed to itself the spiritual conquest of the world.

[1] *Dechamps*, Les sociétés secrètes et la société.

Digitized by Google

Frivolity and moral corruption had become prevalent at the court of France from the time of Louis XIV., and had laid hold of the higher circles. The profligacy and irreligion in the most distinguished of these found expression in the literature of the day, which reproduced the blasphemous and immoral witticisms of the salons. They gave considerable impetus to the circulation of the Free-thinking writings of the day in France. Then, too, the scientific material which unchristian English writers had gathered together was specially welcomed by such Frenchmen as were equally frivolous-minded, and was used by them for similar purposes. Besides this, notwithstanding the national division between England and France, many Englishmen, such as Bolingbroke, worked with deleterious influence in Paris, while in return many free-thinking Frenchmen lived in England. Among the latter was Charles de St. Denys Evremonde (+ at London, 1703, at the age of ninety). He was a bitter enemy of religion, and an Epicurean. After his death his works, written in French, were eagerly read.

Yet in France the representatives of infidelity were obliged to proceed with some caution. The English deists, in combating Christianity, had taken their standpoint on the knowledge of the natural world, the science of Nature; but their French imitators occupied themselves rather with descriptions of travels, monographs, and historical transactions, in order to give a value to their endeavors to overturn faith and morals. Bayle the sceptic proclaimed religion to be of no value, and was very zealous in his denunciation of compulsory religion. Montesquieu (+ 1755), in his "Persian Letters," ridiculed the doctrines and practices of the Christian religion, which Count Henry of Bouillon Villars, in his "Life of Mahomet," ranked below Islamism.

About the middle of the eighteenth century, the philosophers in France entered on a systematic warfare against Christianity. At the head of these stood the talented and versatile but coarse and immoral Francis Arouet de Voltaire, whose watchword was, "Écrasez l'infâme!" ("Crush the infamous thing!") thereby meaning Christianity. His glowing and fervid hate speaks out in his witty and obscene pages. He calls the narratives of Holy Writ imitations of the mythological fables, and revives the calumnies of Celsus against the apostles and the first Christians. He overwhelms the ceremonies of the Church, the bishops and priests, with a stream of insults and vile suspicions. With him were associated D'Alembert (+ 1783), who was more reticent and scientific, and Diderot (+ 1784), who

Digitized by Google

openly and in the coarsest manner attacked both faith and morals. To these may be added the astronomers Lalande, Volney, and Dupuis, who all wrote against Holy Scripture and religion.

Damilaville, nicknamed the "Hater of God," also belonged to this clique. Their principal organ was the so-called "Encyclopædia," which was commenced in 1751, and inculcated atheism and materialism in a manner more or less veiled. The Count Palatine of Holbach was a member of this godless group. His house became the place of assembly for all the enemies of Church and State. J. J. Rousseau, whose whole life is a frightful picture of religious and moral depravity, praises the state of Nature as that of true happiness, and the savages as the ideal of a happy people. These principles he carries out in his romance of "Émile." In his "Contrat Social" Rousseau traces political life back to a treaty of association, by which the individual surrenders his person and his powers to the guidance of the universal will for the common good. He desires the restoration of the religion of Nature, and the overthrow of Revelation. Rousseau ended his criminal life by poison, in 1778. Helvetius and the infamous Offroy de la Mettrie (+ 1751), with Condillac (+ 1780), preached the most disgusting materialism, which the society of Economists, or Physiocrats, founded by Francis Quesnay, physician in ordinary of Madame de Pompadour, brought into practical use.[1]

Assuredly these so-called philosophers and other enemies of the faith found learned opponents in France,[2] and sometimes even the Government summoned courage to oppose them; but the principles they upheld were not destroyed by the burning of a few godless writings at the hand of the public executioner. The resistance of the Jesuits was put an end to by the suppression of their order. The dissolute lives led at court and by the higher nobility encouraged these so-called philosophers, who found high favor with the ministers Choiseul, Malesherbes, and others, and who, being supported by the intrigues of the Jansenists,[3] continued their assaults,

[1] The most appalling writings of this kind are "Système de la nature" (London and Amsterdam, 1770) and "De l'esprit" (1758).

[2] Besides the Apologists mentioned in § 195, Huetius, Bishop of Avranches (+ 1721), Abbot Hauteville (+ 1742), and especially Bergier (+ 1790), professor in Besançon, and later canon in Paris, came forward as defenders of the Christian religion.

[3] Although no formal alliance existed between them and the Encylopædists for the overthrow of Christianity, yet they played extensively into their hands. Cf. the

Digitized by Google

and contributed ever more and more to the religious and moral ruin of the lower classes. In this way daily the fuel was hoarded up, which, being kindled into a blaze by the French Revolution, was destined to spread destruction far and wide.

§ 207. *Protestant Rationalism.*

Rationalism, although essentially the offspring of Protestantism, was a dangerous enemy to Protestant Orthodoxy; and in the eighteenth century, when it became predominant in the high schools, it dealt a death-blow to Orthodox Lutheranism and Calvinism.

In order not to excite the mistrust of the defenders of Orthodoxy, particularly of the Government, the representatives of rationalistic aims, upon whom the English deists exercised great influence, proceeded at first with much caution. It was not till Frederic II. ascended the throne of Prussia, in 1740, that he, being himself destitute of all religion, afforded them the possibility of expressing their deistic naturalistic views without restraint.

Wonderful to relate, it was the pietistic University of Halle in which the celebrated if not especially prominent Sigismund Baumgarten (+ 1755) paved the way to rationalism by applying the method of his master, Christian Wolf (+ 1754), to theology. Professor John Frederic Gruner, who deduced Christian doctrines from Platonism ("Platonizantes"), and the vain, hypercritical Salomon Semler, who from the year 1752 explained that these doctrines were but localized Jewish ideas ("Judaizantes"), and who made a difference between public religion and one held in private, — these went further than their predecessor, whose pupils they had been.

From Halle, where frivolity and immorality made such inroads among the students, and reached so high a degree that Semler himself at a later period retraced his steps towards a positive Christianity, the enlightenment spread to other universities. During the time in which Christian Augustus Crusius (+ 1775) represented Orthodoxy in Leipsic, John Augustus Ernesti (+ 1781), more a philologian than a theologian, introduced rationalism there. In Göttingen the learned Orientalist John David Michaelis (+ 1791) taught from the year 1750. He imitated the example of Ernesti in

interesting paper, "La lega della teologia moderna colla filosofia ai danni della chiesa di Gesù Cristo" (1787), translated into German under the title "Another Mystery Unveiled," by K. Martin, Bishop of Paderborn. Mentz, 1871.

Digitized by Google

regard to the Old Testament, and went further yet. John Godfrey Eichhorn (+ 1827), from the year 1788 professor, publicly lamented that it was still the practice to preach from a text of the Bible. The historian Henry Philip Conrad Henke, in Helmstädt from the year 1788 (+ 1807), complains perpetually of Christolatry, Bibliolatry, Onomolatry, and accuses the Fathers of the Church of disfiguring Christianity, and talks continually of religious despotism, compulsory teaching, etc. Rationalistic views also attained predominance in the other high schools.

But it was not alone in the domain of theology that the new direction given to Orthodox Lutheranism forced its way. It made itself felt in philosophy and literature. Even the song-books and publications written for mere children are not free from the false enlightenment of the times. The rationalists paid particular attention to the instruction of youth, which instruction they sought to wrench loose from positive Christianity. "Humanity" was to replace Christianity.

With this view Abraham Teller, provost at Berlin (+ 1804), labored. On these principles he wanted to prove that even the Jews were good Christians; and Godfrey Sam. Steinbart, professor in Frankfort (+ 1809), in his system of pure philosophy, or Christian doctrine of happiness, desired to attain the same end by rationalism (1778). John Augustus Eberhard, professor of philosophy in Halle (+ 1809), rejected the doctrine of the atonement through the death of Christ, and the eternity of hell-torments. Ernest Frederic Charles Rosenmüller, professor of the Oriental languages in Leipsic, maintained that the doctrine of the Most Holy Trinity had been introduced by ignorant bishops. A prominent representative of rationalism was Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (+ 1781), who defended indifferentism in his classically written works. In his "Nathan the Wise" he places Christianity, Judaism, and Islamism on the same footing. Herder (+ 1803), the general superintendent in Weimar, placed himself, the older he grew, at a greater distance from positive Christianity, which he sought to replace by his religion of humanity. Wieland (+ 1813) is enthusiastic for a religion of happiness, yet in his "Agathon" he leaves it undecided whether the divine or animal nature in man is the better. Schiller and Goethe reproduce in attractive forms the natural rationalistic ideas, the representative of which in the domain of philosophy was Immanuel Kant (+ 1804), professor in Königsberg. The philosophy of Fichte (+ 1814) on identity, and that propounded by

Digitized by Google

F. J. Jacobi (+ 1819) on the intuitive conception of faith as opposed to reason, are alike subversive of the Christian doctrine.

Yet more vehemently than those named above did Edelmann (+ 1767) try to controvert Christianity. He demanded the abolition of the Christian Koran. John Bernard Basedow, the founder of the Philanthropians in Dessau, who in meanness and profligacy was only surpassed by the immoral and licentious Charles Frederic Bahrdt (+ 1792), was also opposed to Christianity.

In order to disseminate enlightenment more successfully, the rationalistic leaders founded several unions, and endeavored to become the rulers of the combined literature of Germany. Their main organ was the "Universal German Library" (one hundred and six volumes), founded in 1765 by the bookseller Nicolai in Berlin, — a literary periodical which systematically decried all writings of a positive faith as stupid and ignorant, and thus brought them into discredit, while it lauded and recommended all heterodox and naturalistic writings. "The Society for the Diffusion of Light and Truth," founded by Biester, the publisher of the "Berlin Monthly," and the "German Union" were equally enthusiastic for the dissemination of rationalism.

It is assuredly true that Protestant Orthodoxy also found its defenders; but neither the writings of such Lutheran theologians as Pastor Götze in Hamburg (+ 1786), nor the ordinances issued by the Government for the protection of Orthodoxy, availed to stem the flood of rationalism. This is proved by the edict of Woellner, the Prussian minister,[1] issued on the 9th of June, 1788. The representatives of rationalism rejected the Orthodox teaching of the symbolic books, and appealed to the Bible as the only source of faith.

But in order to refute all the objections brought against the enlightened, they brought forward new views respecting the canon and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, composed rationalistic trans-

[1] The following passage of this edict is interesting: "Meanwhile it is our will, principally from our great predilection for freedom of conscience, to concede so far as to grant that those of the clergy who are already in public employment, even if it be known of them that they, alas! are more or less infected by the errors denounced in § 7, should tranquilly retain their office; only they must, in the instruction of their congregations, sacredly and inviolably maintain the precepts laid down in this system of doctrine. If they should, on the contrary, oppose this the command of the governor of the country, and not set forth truly and fundamentally this system of their peculiar confession, such a determined opposition to the commands of their ruler shall be met without fail by deposition from office and by still severer punishments." (Latest Religious Events in the Year 1780, p. 659 sqq.)

Digitized by Google

lations of the Bible after the pattern of the Wertheim translations (1737) by Laurence Smith, and invented the accommodation theory, by the help of which all the passages disagreeable to them could be explained away.

§ 208. *Rationalism in Catholic Circles.*

The false enlightenment so much lauded by French atheists, and by the rationalistic professors, *beaux esprits* (fine wits), consistorial counsellors, and journalists of Germany, found propagators and protectors both in temporal and in spiritual princes, who not only permitted the heretical and destructive principles of an unchristian theology to be taught in their high schools, but surrendered their very selves as tools for the practical carrying out of the same.

Laurence Isenbiehl, educated in Göttingen, professor at Mentz, in seeking to introduce the Protestant rationalistic explanation of the Bible, denied that the passage in Isaias vii. 14 had any reference to the Messias; but he incurred deposition and imprisonment thereby, and in 1779 finally submitted to the judgment of the Church.

But in Austria, under the Emperor Joseph II., the Illuminati, or men of the so-termed enlightenment, proceeded more at ease in the contempt they showered in word and writing on religion and morals. Even the representatives of learning were seized with the enlightenment craze, which the routine of studies laid down by the Abbé Rautenstrauch had already prepared the students to adopt. The characteristic of the philosophical and theological works which appeared at that time in Austria is a spiritless superficiality, a blind imitation of the Protestant leadership, and a frivolity absolutely repulsive to a truly educated man, with which the "purifiers of faith" attacked the dogmas, the institutions, and the hierarchy of the Church.

Rationalistic views made their way into other Catholic universities also, even if not in the same degree. The Benedictines of Salzburg, even though they were disciples of Kant, were in good faith; whereas Professor Danzer took the side of the new lights, and found in the Archbishop Jerome a protector against the Orthodox theologians. The "High-German Literary Gazette" (1788–1799) represented more or less the false principles. The theological faculty in Würzburg numbered, besides her Orthodox professors, Oberthür, Rosshirt, Feder, and Berg, who all accepted the novel views. The

Digitized by Google

Würzburger "Learned Indicator" and the "Literary Gazette," edited by the Benedictines in Banz, had not escaped a taint of the anti-ecclesiastical stream of the times. Fulda and Erfurt were not in all particulars correct.

But the universities of the three archbishops on the Rhine were in the greatest degree influenced by the bad spirit of the age. At Treves, the professors Oehmbs, Haubs, Weber, Conrad, and others were not precisely enemies to the Church, yet they were strongly infected with rationalism. This applies still more to Professor Werner, who with unsparing hand lays hold of the most venerable institutions and drags them down to the dust, subordinates the Church to the State, etc.; and to Castello, who insults and slanders the defenders of faith, that he may the more exalt the anti-ecclesiastical writers. Rationalism had full sway in the University of Bonn, which the Electoral Prince Maximilian Franz founded in 1786 in order to ruin the old Catholic High School of Cologne. Here taught Philip Hedderich, professor of ecclesiastical law, who openly boasted of his condemnation by the Holy See. The expositor Thaddeus of St. Adam reproduced all rationalistic heresies in a truly blasphemous manner. Elias Van Schüren at first gave his philosophical lectures according to Feder, afterwards according to Kant. The immoral unbeliever Eulogius Schneider inoculated the frequenters of the gymnasium with the poison of infidelity and of godlessness; and it was not until the indignation of the people had publicly risen against the practices of this man that the authorities apparently interfered in 1790. Schneider figured afterwards as a hero of the Revolution in 1794, and died on the scaffold. The University of Mentz also stood under the influence of "enlightened" professors. F. A. Blau taught the dogmatics, which he propounded in the shallowest form of rationalism; and in his anonymous writings he denied even the infallibility of the Church and the divine institution of Confession. United with him in the destruction of everything holy was A. J. Dorsch, professor of philosophy, — a miserable echo of Kant, a man without faith or morals. At their side stood Jung as professor of Church history, and Becker as moralist, who also followed in the irreligious stream of the era. G. Köhler, professor of liturgy, a Benedictine, compromised himself, though in a less degree.

The spirit of the times is mirrored in the plainest, most significant manner, in the "Mentz Monthly Publication of Spiritual Matters," from the year 1785. Its principal editor was J. K.

Digitized by Google

Müller, prefect of the gymnasium. The "Journal of Religion," on the other hand, edited by the zealous Jesuit Hermann Goldhagen, from the year 1776, defended the affairs of the Church, while the archbishops worked together for the destruction of all genuine religious feeling.

The false enlightenment was not confined to the professor's lecture-room; it made itself felt in the composition of popular literature, in prayer-books and devotional works, and even in song-books, to the great annoyance of the faithful people, who instinctively shrank from these watery products of the brain, and refused to exchange their books of devotion, so full of faith and unction, for the productions of a cold rationalism.

The real object of the exertions of these rationalists was what they termed reform, by which they meant, levelling the liturgy, by especially casting out all the higher and mystical elements, substituting for it a bare morality in the sense of the philosophy of Kant, and promoting a union with Protestantism on the foundation of a religious indifferentism; it meant also enmity to the religious orders, and, finally, the establishment of a national church.

The most violent opposition to the Church, and against the constitution of the State, proceeded from the Order of Illuminati, which was founded by the notorious A. Weishaupt, professor of canon law in Ingolstädt, 1776. It was divided into the grades of Magus and Rex, or Priest and King, and was to make an end of the rule of parsons and knaves. To this union belonged high and low, clerics and laymen; but the real object aimed at was known but to few members. The order obtained such extended power that it provided tutors for princes, professors for the universities, commanders for the fortresses, counsellors and ministers to princes-regnant, who then also promoted their fellow-members. At last the dangerous society was suppressed by the Electoral Bavarian Government in 1785. Meantime it is difficult to assign limits to the devastation it caused.

Most of the men named above belonged to it. Fellow-members of it were also B. A. Werkmeister, an ex-Benedictine, and Catholic chaplain at the court of Duke Charles of Würtemberg in Stuttgart, and Philip Brunner, parish priest at Tiefenbach. The first was an incarnate rationalist, who in several anonymous writings sought to bring down religion to the circuit of naturalism, and uttered many blasphemies. His friend Brunner cherished the same opinions, for the dissemination of which he desired to found an "Academy of

Digitized by Google

Science for Catholic Germany." The central point was to be Mentz; and Dalberg, the Free-thinking canon, who was afterwards coadjutor, was to undertake the protectorate thereof. Concerning the tendency of this association Brunner speaks without circumlocution in two letters, one of which is addressed to the ex-Capuchin of Mentz, the other to Professor Norbert Nimis.

In opposition to these destructive tendencies, the Catholic people and the greater part of the clergy held on, with unwavering fidelity, to the faith and to the institutions of Holy Mother Church, and withstood, with an energetic resistance and most solid argumentative writings, alike the godless practices in vogue and the shameless attacks made on religion.

The Jesuits were peculiarly the objects of hatred to the enemies of the Church; on which account, heresy, unbelief, and false enlightenment joined together, to annihilate, by exterior force, an order with which they could not compete in learning and science.

§ 209. *Hostility to the Jesuits and Suppression of their Order.*

The activity so fraught with blessings which distinguished the order of Jesuits attracted to them the hate of the enemies of the Church, who by every means at their disposal attacked their Institute and at length accomplished its suppression.

The contest was carried on with great warmth about the middle of the eighteenth century, particularly in Portugal, in which the Marquis de Pombal, Carvalho, held the reins of government in lieu of the incapable king Joseph Emmanuel. This parvenu was filled with an implacable hatred towards the high nobility and the clergy, the victims to which hatred the Jesuits were to become. After his first plan of convicting them as guilty of revolutionary plots had failed, Pombal hired pamphleteers to calumniate them systematically; and then, on the ground of these false accusations, he extorted a brief from Pope Benedict XIV. (1757) by which Cardinal Saldanha was commissioned to make a visitation in the houses of the order. The cardinal performed his office in the very spirit of Pombal's intention. The commands he laid upon the Jesuits were but the prelude to harsher measures. An attempt to assassinate the king was laid to the charge of the order; and the members of it, against whom the prosecution (which was conducted with frightful injustice and utter neglect of the forms of law) brought not a shadow of proof of guilt, were either stripped of everything,

Digitized by Google

packed together closely in ships, and set on shore on the coasts of the States of the Church, or they were immured in horrible prisons.) As the reason of such unheard-of treatment, the crimes of the Jesuits were alleged, who, it was maintained, had transgressed the rules of their Holy Institute. It was not until Queen Maria (1777) ascended the throne that the prisoners were restored to liberty. Most of them had by that time succumbed to hunger and misery of every sort. Then the punishment he had merited at length overtook Pombal, who had transformed the University of Coimbra into an arsenal of godlessness and freemasonry. In 1781 he was convicted of gross embezzlement, condemned to an exemplary punishment, and only pardoned on account of his extreme old age.

The ancient enemies of the Jesuits in France, the Jansenists and Huguenots, were powerfully supported in their exertions against them, in the eighteenth century, by the atheistical philosophers and Encyclopædists, and also gained faithful allies in the ill-famed Pompadour and the minister Choiseul. The motives which influenced these parties were indeed different; but their object was the same, — the destruction of the order, to which also the Jansenistic-revolutionary Parliament lent a helping hand. A disposition inimical to the Jesuits had already been manifested in 1757, at the prosecution of Damiens; but the fierce storm broke over the order after the unfortunate undertaking of La Valette[1] had miscarried. The Parliament (1760) adjudged the whole order to be responsible for the failure, and condemned them to pay the creditors of one whom they had expelled from among them; on this occasion also they gave utterance to the most hateful sentiments against the Institute.

In order to prejudice the public mind against the order, the

[1] La Valette had formerly been superior of the order on the island of Martinico, but was no longer a member of the society. After he had brought the French colony into a prosperous condition, he became insolvent in consequence of some vessels laden with millions' worth of goods being captured by the hostile English. A merchant-house in Marseilles laid a claim on the order for a debt of four million livres; this they repudiated, as La Valette, so far from being commissioned by them, had been first reproved by them, then expelled from the order, which had even then to meet a similar demand on his account. On this refusal a universal storm broke forth against the Jesuits. The commercial house won its suit before the Consulate of Marseilles and before the chambers of the Parisian Parliament; the latter converted the civil process into a criminal one, and demanded the forfeiture of the constitution and privileges of the whole order. *Hergenröther*, ii. 563.

Digitized by Google

so-called "Extracts" were published, purporting to be taken from the writings of the Jesuits,[1] and to contain immoral and treasonable doctrines. This miserable piece of work, the author of which imputes false doctrine to the Jesuits, wrests passages from their context, and lays the mistakes of a few individuals on the whole order, was circulated all over France, while not even the right of defending themselves was accorded to the Jesuits.

Force completed that which had been begun by falsehood and calumny. At the instigation of the Abbé Chauvelin, the Parliament of Paris concluded, in 1761, to close the Jesuit colleges; and on Aug. 6, 1762, the Society of Jesus was suppressed, because "in their doctrine they were godless and sacrilegious, and in their acts were pernicious alike to Church and State." But a few months before this, fifty bishops assembled at Paris had borne a most glorious testimony in favor of the order.

The weak-minded monarch, Louis XV., who was controlled by his mistresses, and whose objections to the Decree of 1761 had not been listened to, could not resolve on any energetic action against the decree of suppression of Aug. 6, 1762; but the whole episcopate of France protested against it. Pope Clement XIII., on the 3d of September declared the decree to be null and void. These protests were of no avail. The Parliament, which had also adjudged the pastoral letter of Archbishop Christopher de Beaumont to the flames, in 1764 left the Jesuits only the alternative either to declare their Institute abominable and dangerous to the State or to go into exile. They chose the latter. The king at last gave consent to the suppression of the Society, but allowed the members of it to remain in France as private persons. The brief "Apostolicum" (1765), by which the Pope confirmed the order anew, and commended it, neither effected the restoration of the order to France, nor hindered the Jesuits from being driven out of Spain.

The chief agitators against the Society in this last-named country were the ministers Aranda and De Roda, who, being supported by the enemies of the Church, had, after an insurrection of the people in Madrid, excited the distrustful king Charles III. against the order, and by means of a shameful deception extorted (also in 1766) a decree of banishment against them, which in the mother-

[1] Extraits des assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses, que les Jésuites ont enseignées avec l'approbation, vérifiés par les commissaires du Parlement. Paris, 1762.

Digitized by Google

land (on the 2d and 3d of April) and in the colonies was put in force with great severity. The principal motive of this barbarous conduct Charles kept "concealed in his royal bosom." The petitions of the Pope and those of the Spanish Episcopate had no power to move him from his purpose. The example of Spain was imitated in Naples (1767) under the reign of Charles's son Ferdinand IV., for whom Tanucci, the enemy of the Church, governed the kingdom. The same took place in the dukedom of Parma and Piacenza (1768), over which Ferdinand, the brother of Charles, held sway.

When we look at the men from whom the enmity towards the Jesuits sprung, and the means of which they availed themselves, together with the conduct of the clergy and people, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the order was the innocent victim of a revolutionary and godless party, to which crowned heads in their miserable blindness lent their aid.

The enemies of the Church were not content with driving out the Jesuits from some countries. On Dec. 10, 1768, they, with their royal confederates, demanded of Clement XIII., under threats, the formal suppression of the order. The Pope firmly refused this unreasonable proposition; but unfortunately, his successor, Clement XIV., did not possess the steadfastness of character of his predecessor. Besieged by the Bourbon courts, he, for the sake of peace, signed the brief of suppression, "Dominus ac redemptor noster," July 21, 1773. It was first published on Aug. 16.

Without making the slightest objection, the members of the order submitted to the decision of the Pope, whose brief had not a single crime to lay to their charge. The general of the Jesuits, Lorenzo Ricci, died in the Castle of St. Angelo, 1775, solemnly attesting the innocence of the order.

No one can question the right that Pope Clement XIV. had to suppress a spiritual order; but his conduct was harsh and unjust in itself, and in its consequences injurious. His compliance by no means brought to the Church the wished-for peace. Antagonism to the Church and especially to the Holy See now showed a broader front; while the ex-Jesuits, forgetting the sufferings they had undergone, came forth as champions of the papacy.

In spite of the brief of suppression, the Jesuits still held possession of the Jesuit colleges of Mohilev and Polotzk in White Russia, for which Catherine II. interceded. Pius VI. (1782) even permitted the Fathers to choose a general-vicar for Russia. Pius VII. per-

Digitized by Google

mitted them, under the Emperor Paul, to settle in the whole of Russia in 1801. The same Pope, on Aug. 7, 1814, restored the order to its rank in religion.

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

§ 210. *The Celebration of Divine Worship. — Christian Art. — Religious Life.*

THE Fathers of the Council of Trent gave special rules for the worthy celebration of divine service, for the guidance of the preacher's office, and for affording Christian instruction, in order to prevent any unseemly act from interfering with devotion; they also sought, through the newly edited and improved liturgical books, to exclude all possibility of caprice being exercised in the administration of the sacraments, etc.

Church chant, or song, was also an object of the business of the synod, which desired to exclude every worldly and undignified form from its practice.[1] John Pierluigi, from Palestrina (+ 1594), acquired immortal renown in the department of the science of music: his compositions for the artistic blending of individual voices in harmony fully met the requirements of the Council of Trent. His "Missa Papae Marcelli" (1555), which gave new expression to the choral ecclesiastical singing, is a masterpiece. The music school established in Rome by St. Philip Neri gave occasion to the oratorios. In the seventeenth century a new direction was given to Church music, which accorded less with Church principles.

The festivals of the Church were increased by the festival of the Holy Rosary, that of the Five Wounds, and that of the Name and of the Sacred Heart of Jesus;[2] on the other hand, Benedict XIV. and Clement XIV. diminished the number of festivals, at the earnest request of several courts that had refused to have the above-named feasts celebrated from reasons of State. The Way of the Cross and that of the Stations were intended to compensate for the pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

[1] "Ab ecclesiis vero musicas eas, ubi sive organo sive cantu lascivum aut impurum aliquid miscetur . . . arceant." (Sess. 22, Dec. de observ. et evitand. in celebr. missae.)

[2] The Jansenists made a point of opposing the latter devotion, which nevertheless continued to spread in all directions. *Dalgairns,* The Sacred Heart of Jesus. Mentz, 1862.

Digitized by Google

The use in public devotions of such litanies as had not been sanctioned by the Church was forbidden in 1601 by Pope Clement VIII., in the constitution "Sanctissimus," and the introduction of new litanies in public worship was made dependent on the approval of the Congregation of Rites. The approved litanies are those of All Saints and of Loretto, to which was added (Aug. 21, 1862) that of the Name of Jesus.

According to the rule given by the Council of Trent (Sess. 25), in the granting of indulgences "moderation" was to be observed, and "all scandalous gains" were to be avoided. Sick people were strenuously urged to receive the sacraments.[1]

The Ecclesiastical Inquisition, newly organized by Pope Paul III., and more widely extended by Pius V. and Sixtus V., continued to exist in Rome; in other countries of Christendom this institution was done away with in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The style of Church architecture in the sixteenth century was principally that of the Renaissance, which in the time of Louis XIV. degenerated into the Rococo, or ornamental style, while the Barok style of the Jesuits tried a medium course.

The Church paintings and sculpture bear the unmistakable stamp of an age which had renounced the higher aims and the ideal of the dark ages, to give expression to their naturalistic and sensual views.

But a greater triumph was reserved for poetry, which bore the spirit of the Church, and cast into the shade the conceptions of the Humanists, both as to matter and form.

As regards religious life at this period, it is not to be doubted that its discipline, which had fallen into decay in many ways, in consequence of the Reformation, was revived by the activity of the Council of Trent. The devastating wars, especially the Thirty Years' War, were very prejudicial to faith and morals, and had carried rough manners and uncouth behavior in their train. After peace had been again restored to Germany, a religious and moral renovation proceeded at a very cheering rate of progression till about the middle of the eighteenth century, when the infidel enlightenment took possession of the higher classes, and by degrees drew the lower ranks of the people into the snare. France espe-

[1] Pius V. decreed (1566), in the bull "Supra gregem Dominicum" (Bull. ed. Taur. tom. vii. p. 436 sqq.), that physicians should admonish the sick to receive the Sacraments, "neque tertio die ulterius eos visitent," etc., unless they were willing to confess their sins. This decree was renewed by Benedict XIII. (1725) and Pius IX. (1869).

Digitized by Google

cially became in the eighteenth century a scene of unbelieving and frivolous efforts, which found countenance and protection at the court of the "Most Christian" king, and first corrupted the higher nobility, leading them to irreligion and immorality, while in the sequel it exercised a terrible result and brought most painful consequences to the common people. In Spain and Portugal heresy, with its sad results, met with an energetic opposition. It was not till royal absolutism made common cause with Freemasonry that some small portion of the clergy and people were won over to the false enlightenment, to which the healthy and ecclesiastically inclined majority of the people of Spain and Portugal were always averse. In Italy the reformatory efforts of many saintly men and women were not without result (see § 186), although the spirit of the times rendered the development of a true religious life very difficult.

But in spite of such a lamentable state of things, the fact still remains indisputable, that during this period the Church left no means untried that could conduce to the religious and moral perfection of the faithful; that, as a whole, she effected the most beautiful results, and in fact brought forth in every land saints whose examples were bright patterns for their contemporaries.

Besides Palestrina (*Baini*, Mem. della vita di G. P. da Palestr. 2 vols. Roma, 1828), the Spaniard Morales, a member of the Papal Chapel in Rome, Guerrero, Ortiz, and especially L. da Vittoria, chapel master of St. Apollinare in Rome were celebrated composers; besides these, the Italians Dentice, Festa, John and Paul Animuccia, Felix and Francis Anerio, Agostini, and the celebrated Gregory Allegri (+ 1652). France also possessed distinguished musical artists in Arcadelt and Goudimel, whose pupil was Palestrina.

Among the masters of the Netherlands, Orlando di Lasso (1520–1594) is especially eminent. See *Gerbert*, De cantu et musica sacra a prima ecclesiae aetate usque ad praesens tempus, tom. ii. Typis scl. Blasianis, 1774. On the painters of the Renaissance, see the works given in § 151. The best known are the Italians Domenechino and Guido Reni, the Spaniard Murillo, and P. P. Rubens, of the Netherlands. Among the poets of the Church we may give a high rank to the Polish Jesuit Casimir Sarbiewski (+ 1640), and his companion in the order, James Balde (+ 1668). Their Latin hymns and songs vie in elegance of diction with those of the ancient classics. In Spain, Lope de Vega (+ 1635) and Calderon (+ 1687) glorify Christian heroism and the mysteries of religion, especially the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar, by their thoroughly artistic, profound, and fervently pious dramatic poems ("Autos sacramentales"). In Italy Torquato Tasso gives a better direction to literature by his "Epos," — "Jerusalem Delivered."

Digitized by Google

PERIOD II.

FROM THE FRENCH REVOLUTION DOWN TO OUR OWN DAY.

A. EXTERIOR HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

I. SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

§ 211. *Missions in the East Indies, China, Japan, etc.*

IN the nineteenth century Catholic missions resumed a flourishing condition; secular priests and those of the regular orders, especially members of the newly revived order of the Jesuits, united their endeavors either to enkindle the light of faith in heathen lands or to prevent it from being extinguished. Many societies were founded to support and aid the missionaries by alms and prayer. Among these, the Society of Lyons for the spreading of the faith holds the first place (1822).

The ancient Portuguese bishoprics in the East Indies were hindered in their operation by the English conquerors, and were gradually tending to complete decay. The Holy See therefore erected apostolic vicariates[1] for the territories under English dominion; and Gregory XVI., by his brief "Multa praeclare," in 1838 suppressed some of the bishoprics. The archbishopric of Goa and the bishopric of Macao were retained, but their mission had to be confined to the territory of the Portuguese. The following difficulties retarded the progress of the missions until very recently, but of late they have been carried on with considerable success.[2]

Under the Dutch Government, Catholic missionaries were severely oppressed in Ceylon. Their position became more tolerable when the English took possession of the island in 1796. Since the year 1849 there have been two apostolic vicariates, Jaffna and Colombo, in Ceylon. The native Christians are remarkable for their faithful attachment to the Church, and for a touching willingness to con-

[1] There are about 1,221,000 Catholics in British India and Siam.

[2] By a new Concordat concluded between Rome and Portugal, the apostolic vicariates of the whole peninsula and of the island of Ceylon, and also the prefecture in Central Bengal, are converted into episcopal sees. The archbishopric of Goa has been raised to the dignity of a patriarchate.

tribute to all Church purposes; the number of the heathen converted daily increases; while many of the "Christians of the Government" — namely, the Protestants — either fall back into Buddhism or enter the Catholic Church.

In Farther India the Christian missionaries found the inhabitants of Birmah and Siam but little inclined to Christianity, on the whole. They had greater success in the kingdom of Anam, which includes the provinces of Tonquin, Cochin China, etc. Notwithstanding the almost continuous persecutions of the Christians since the year 1830, the adherents of Christianity are constantly on the increase in the kingdom of Anam.

The apostolic vicariate for Agra and Thibet (1808) was confided to the Capuchins. In the year 1844 the Lazarists Huc and Gabet succeeded in gaining an entrance into Lassa, where they made many conversions; but they were expelled at the instance of the Chinese ambassador. Other missionaries attempting to enter the country in 1851 suffered martyrdom. The chief enemies of Christianity are the Lamas, who frustrate the efforts of the missionaries.

Towards the end of the reign of the Emperor Kien-long, persecution had ceased in China. It was, however, renewed with great violence under the tyrant Kia-king (1795–1820), who ordered thousands of Catholics to be cruelly put to death. The victories of the French and English at last effected a treaty in the year 1858, by which Christian missionaries were to be freely permitted to enter the empire. This permission was reinforced after the capture of Pekin in 1860. The Society of the Holy Childhood, founded in 1843 by Bishop Forbin-Janson of Nancy, did a great deal of good. Persecution has not yet, however, entirely ceased in China. In the year 1870 the cruel murder of the Sisters of Charity and of the Lazarists took place at Tien-tsin. After the outbreak of the late war with France the condition of the Christians in China again grew very deplorable.[1] The greatest number of the martyrs of the Church in modern times suffered at the peninsula of Corea.

The missions at Japan, where the native Christians are still exposed to the oppressions and persecutions of the imperial officers, are placed under the direction of an apostolic pro-vicar. The apostolic pro-vicar Gérard built a church at Yokahama in 1862. The persecution which broke out in 1867 increased after the Revolution of 1868, and caused the death of numerous Christians.

[1] A promising event is the recent establishment of diplomatic relations between the Chinese Empire and the Holy See.

MONASTIC LIBRARY OF THE ABBEY OF GETHSEMANI
Digitized by Google

Missions in North America, including the United States, British North America, and Mexico.

§ 212. *The Catholic Church in the United States.*[1]

I. The unceasing labors of the Church have been crowned by very cheering results in the New World. We will, in the first place, speak of the progress of religion in the United States of North America.

Before the Revolution of 1776 Catholicity[2] was held on a somewhat precarious tenure in the thirteen original States of the present Union. The whole number of its adherents did not exceed twenty-five thousand. The penal laws, enforced with such animosity against the Catholic Church in the British Isles, were also put into execution in the English colonies of the West. It was the important and noble co-operation of Catholics, and the aid rendered by Catholic nations during the warfare for political independence, that induced the inauguration of the policy of toleration, — a policy which motives of expediency rendered advisable, even if the movers of it had not been, as we hope they were, actuated by higher motives of what was in justice due to so large a number of their fellow-citizens. A change of public sentiment in favor of Catholics manifested itself as time went on, although prejudice and bigotry still held sway over many minds. An amendment to the Federal Constitution in 1787, which was ratified in 1791, granted religious freedom in explicit terms.

Before and during the War of Independence the Catholics had been subject to the spiritual jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of London. After the war the American clergy, wisely taking the altered circumstances into consideration, petitioned for an ecclesiastical superior for their own country; this was given to them in the person of the celebrated Rev. *John Carroll.* By a bull of November, 1789, he was, in conformity with the nomination of the clergy, appointed first Bishop of Baltimore, and consecrated, Aug. 15, 1790, by Rt. Rev. Bishop Walmsley in London. The number of Catholics in his diocese of the then United States was about thirty thousand among a white population of a little more than three millions. On his return to the wide field of labor now opened to him, the zealous bishop, on Nov. 7, 1791, convened his first diocesan synod, at which twenty-two clergymen assembled and passed regulations suitable for the government of the young Church. The political

[1] *J. O'Kane Murray,* Hist. of the Cath. Church in the United States. Rev. *C. J. White,* D.D., Sketch of the Cath. Church, Appendix to *Darras's* General Hist. of the Church. *De Courcy's* Cath. Church in the United States, translated by *J. G. Shea.* *Clarke's* Lives of Deceased Bishops. *Bayley's* Life of Bishop Bruté. *Fitton's* Hist. of the Church in New England. Bishop *England's* Works. 5 vols. *J. G. Shea,* Hierarchy of the Cath. Ch. in the U.S. Catholic Historical Researches. By Rev. *A. A. Lambing.*

[2] North American Review. January, 1876.

Digitized by Google

revolution in France, so disastrous at home, produced good effects for the Church on this continent. It induced many able priests to seek a refuge here. In 1791 the *Abbé Emery*, superior-general of the Sulpitians in France, sent a number of clergymen to found an ecclesiastical seminary at Baltimore. In the year following, this institution received an eminent student in the person of the Russian prince *D. A. Gallitzin*,[1] who was ordained by Bishop Carroll in 1795, and became the apostle of western Pennsylvania. A new arrival of French priests, six of whom afterwards became bishops, enabled Bishop Carroll to provide more fully for the wants of the faithful, — as, for example, in Kentucky,[2] — and to send missionaries to the Indian tribes in the north of the Union.

The gradual introduction of religious communities and the progressive establishment of learned institutions promoted the life of piety and religion; while the revival in the United States of the Society of Jesus, under the direction of Rev. *Robert Molyneux*, in 1805, attracted old members from Europe, some of whom entered as professors at the Georgetown College, which had been already founded by Dr. Carroll. The first establishment of Dominicans was founded in Washington County, Kentucky, by Rev. *Edward Fenwick* (1806). Augustinians from Dublin, Ireland, settled at Philadelphia in 1809. Mount St. Mary's College, at Emmitsburg, Maryland, was founded by Rev. *John Dubois* in 1809. The Visitation Nuns were founded by Mother *Teresa*, under the direction of Rt. Rev. *Leonard Neale*, coadjutor of Bishop Carroll from the year 1800. The Sisters or Daughters of Charity at Emmitsburg, Maryland, were organized in 1809 by the renowned Mother *Seton*[3] (+ 1821), who had become a convert to Catholicity in New York.

In 1803 Louisiana was purchased by the United States, and Dr. Carroll was directed by the Holy See to attend to the vacant diocese of New Orleans, which had become an episcopal see in 1793. Dr. Carroll appointed Rev. *Donatian Olivier* as his vicar in Louisiana; to him succeeded Rev. *William V. Dubourg*. The tide of immigration, especially from France and Ireland, having swollen the number of Catholics to about a hundred and fifty thousand in the year 1808, the Holy See thought it expedient to raise Baltimore to the rank of an archiepiscopal see, with four suffragan sees attached to it; namely, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Bardstown. Rev. *Michael Egan* was appointed to Philadelphia, Rev. *John B. Cheverus* to Boston, and Rev. *Benedict Joseph Flaget* to Bardstown; their consecration took place at Baltimore in 1810. The Rev. *Luke Concanen*, a Dominican who had been consecrated at Rome for the see of New York, died at Naples, before embarking for the West. The spiritual affairs of that diocese were then administered by two zealous Jesuits, *Anthony Kohlmann*, as vicar-general, and *Benedict J. Fen-*

[1] Miss *Brownson's* Life of Gallitzin. 1 vol. See Researches, Oct., 1886.

[2] Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky, by Hon. *B. Webb*. Rev. S. T. Badin, the first priest ordained in the United States, was sent to Kentucky in 1794.

[3] *White's* Life of Mrs. Seton.

Digitized by Google

wick, to whom the erection of St. Patrick's Cathedral was due. After the death of Bishop Egan in 1814, Rev. *Louis de Barth* conducted the diocese of Philadelphia as administrator; he introduced the Sisters of Charity from Emmitsburg, who formed the first colony sent out by Mother Seton. Bishop Flaget of Bardstown established an ecclesiastical seminary, and introduced the Lorettines, instituted by the saintly father *Charles Nerinckx*[1] of Kentucky.

At the time that the cause of religion was advancing in the most favorable manner, the illustrious patriarch of the American Church, the saintly archbishop Carroll, died, at the age of eighty-one, on Dec. 3, 1815. He was succeeded by his coadjutor, Rev. Leonard Neale, who survived him only eighteen months, and was himself succeeded by the Rev. *Ambrose Maréchal,* who, like his predecessors, had to meet with opposition from unprincipled clergymen and insubordinate laymen. Trusteeism was creating many troubles almost everywhere.

In 1820 the bishopric of Charleston, embracing the Carolinas and Georgia, was established, and Dr. *John England* from Ireland became its first pastor. Rt. Rev. *Patrick Kelly,* who in the same year was appointed Bishop of Richmond, Virginia, where the faith was as yet but slowly advancing, was, on reconsideration, recalled and transferred to the see of Waterford, Ireland, in 1822. A year after the erection of the diocese of Charleston, Cincinnati became an episcopal see, embracing Ohio, Michigan, and the Northwest Territory; Rev. Edward Fenwick of the Dominican Order became its first bishop. In the year 1815 the Rev. William V. Dubourg was appointed to the vacant see of New Orleans, where great discord had prevailed. On this bishop's return from Rome, in 1817, he brought with him a number of Lazarists or priests of the Congregation of the Mission, who founded St. Mary's Seminary of the Barrens, Perry County, Missouri. Rt. Rev. Bishop Dubourg labored for several years in Missouri, where he introduced other religious communities. In 1823 he moved to New Orleans, and received a coadjutor in Rev. *Joseph Rosati,* who, in 1826, was appointed first Bishop of St. Louis for upper Louisiana, while in the same year, on the resignation of Bishop Dubourg, Rev. *Leo de Neckere* was appointed to the see of New Orleans, which also embraced the territory of Mississippi.

The low country embracing Alabama, Florida, and Arkansas Territory became a vicariate apostolic in 1825. Rev. *Michael Portier* became Vicar Apostolic; and in 1829, when the same district was formed into a diocese, the same reverend gentleman was appointed first Bishop of Mobile. Towards the close of 1815 the vacant see of New York, embracing the States of New York and New Jersey, was filled by the learned Dominican Rev. *John Connolly,* who died in 1825, and was succeeded by Rev. John Dubois, President of Mount St. Mary's College. At that time the number of Catholics had, it is estimated, risen to the number of a hundred and fifty thousand, owing principally to increasing immigration. Bishop Dubois, like his predecessor, had to struggle with insolent trustees. Religion was on the increase in the diocese of Bards-

[1] See Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx, by Bishop *Maes.*

Digitized by Google

town. In 1819 Rev. Father *John B. David* was consecrated coadjutor to Bishop Flaget. The colleges of St. Mary's and St. Joseph's were founded in that diocese.

The see of Boston, the centre of the Church in the New England States, became vacant, in 1823, by the departure of Bishop Cheverus, who became Cardinal Archbishop of Bordeaux. He was succeeded by the pious and energetic Benedict J. Fenwick, who found in his immense district about fifteen thousand Catholics and only three priests at his disposition. The Church of New England gradually progressed by immigration and by conversions to the faith. After a six years' administration by Father de Barth, the see of Philadelphia was filled, in 1820, by Rev. Dr. *Henry Conwell*, who was during his whole administration almost always in a deplorable contest with the rebellious priest W. Hogan of St. Mary's Church. A compromise regarding the appointment of pastors, which the bishops made with the trustees, was condemned at Rome.

During the administration of Archbishop Maréchal the important Association for the Propagation of the Faith was organized. The venerable archbishop died in 1828, and was succeeded by Rev. Dr. *James Whitfield*. He presided over the FIRST PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE in 1829.

At this council were assembled the bishops of Charleston, Bardstown, Cincinnati, Boston, and St. Louis. The Fathers published thirty-three decrees relative to ecclesiastical discipline, which were approved by the Holy See. The number of Catholics then resident in the United States was estimated at over five hundred thousand.

II. A few years after the death of Archbishop Maréchal, Bishops Fenwick of Cincinnati (1832) and De Neckere of New Orleans (1833) departed from the scene of this life; the former was succeeded by *John B. Purcell*, and the latter by *Anthony Blanc* (1835), while in 1830 *Francis Patrick Kenrick* had been consecrated Bishop-Coadjutor of the distressed diocese of Philadelphia. The new diocese of Detroit, embracing Michigan and the Northwestern Territory, was, in 1833, filled by the Indian missionary *Frederick Rése*.

In October of the same year Archbishop Whitfield convened the SECOND PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE; five other bishops attended. The Fathers of the council adopted a regular mode of nominating bishops to vacant sees. They also made arrangements for taking care of the Indians in the far West. Bishop Dubourg, after his appointment to the see of New Orleans, had already introduced the Jesuits from Maryland into ancient Louisiana. In 1824 they had opened a school for Indian boys at Florissant, where the Ladies of the Sacred Heart had established a school for Indian girls. The missions on the Missouri were then assigned to the Jesuits, and those on the Mississippi to the Lazarists, among whom Fathers *Odin* and *Timon* have acquired special fame as zealous missionaries. The Council of Baltimore confided the main care of the western Indian tribes to the Society of Jesus. Father *Van Quickenborne*, the first Superior in the West of the newly restored order, and founder of the vice-province of Missouri, with the Fathers *Hoecken*,

Digitized by Google

Verreydt, *Verhaegen*, *Schultz*, and other Jesuits, labored with marked success among the Kikapoos, Pottawatomies, Osages, Kaskaskias, and several other tribes until 1850, when the Indian Territory became an apostolic vicariate.

In Michigan and the surrounding country the old Ottawa mission was revived after Cincinnati had been erected into a see. The laborious Sulpitian *Gabriel Richard*, who had already been hard at work among the Ottawas towards the close of the preceding century, *J. V. Badin*, *F. Résé*, *Mazzuchelli*, *De Jean*, and, on the departure of the latter, *F. Baraga*, afterwards Vicar Apostolic of Upper Michigan, *Pierz*, *J. Mrack*, *O. Skolla* (a Franciscan), *Bellecourt*, *Petit*, and others, labored with great devotedness and success among the Ottawas, Chippeways, and Pottawatomies.

At the recommendation of the Second Council of Baltimore, the see of Vincennes was erected in 1834. It comprised Indiana and the greater part of Illinois. *Simon G. Bruté*,[1] its first bishop, was consecrated in October of the same year in the then recently consecrated cathedral of St. Louis. In the same month and year the venerable archbishop Whitfield died; he was immediately succeeded by his coadjutor *Samuel Eccleston*, who had previously been President of St. Mary's College. He presided over the THIRD PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, held in April, 1837, at which eight other prelates assisted. In the pastoral letter they issued, the Fathers took occasion solemnly to protest against the calumnies uttered, and the fanatical spirit of persecution aroused at the progress of Catholicity; the anti-Catholic spirit, which in August, 1834, had led to the destruction of the Ursuline Convent by a Boston mob, had been animating the whole land for several years.[2] Originating in New England, it had been fostered by sectarian ministers, and re-echoed in New York, where a mob, in 1836, attempted to destroy St. Patrick's Cathedral; in Baltimore, where, in 1839, the Carmelite Convent was threatened; and in Philadelphia, where, in 1844, St. Michael's Church was burned.

Notwithstanding these outbursts of bitter bigotry, the Church went on her course of peaceful mission. The Fathers of the Third Provincial Council proposed, as was usually the case at these ecclesiastical meetings, the erection of new dioceses. Those now proposed were, — Dubuque for the Territories of Iowa and Minnesota, Nashville for the State of Tennessee, and Natchez for the State of Mississippi. *Mathias Loras*, previously Vicar-General of Mobile, was appointed to the first-named see. He traversed his vast diocese with holy enthusiasm, providing for the spiritual welfare of the souls intrusted to him, both of the white man and of the red. Father *Ravoux* was placed in charge of a mission among the Sioux; to Father *Pelamourges* was delegated another among the Sacs and Foxes; while that among the Winnebagos was confided to the charge of Father *Cretin*. Bishop Loras did much to attract the tide of immigration to the territories of his diocese. To the see of Nashville, *Richard P. Miles*, a native of Maryland and a member of the Dominican Order, was ap-

[1] Memoirs of Bishop Bruté, by Rt. Rev. Bishop *Bayley*. History of the Cath. Church in the Diocese of Vincennes. By Rev. *H. Alerding*.

[2] See *Murray*, pp. 240, 244, 257.

Digitized by Google

pointed; he was consecrated in 1838. Already had he been a zealous missionary in Kentucky and Ohio. The see of Natchez was filled in 1841 by *John M. Chanche*, a native of Baltimore, a prominent Sulpitian, the appointment having been declined by Rev. *Thomas Hayden* of Pennsylvania. Bishop Chanche, although commencing under trying circumstances, brought his diocese to a comparatively prosperous state of development. He invited the Sisters of Charity, and effected their union with those instituted by St. Vincent de Paul in France, — a fusion which had been greatly desired by Mother Seton. The Fathers of the Council above mentioned also earnestly advocated Catholic journalism, which was then in its infancy.[1] There were five weekly papers: the U. S. Catholic Miscellany (founded in 1822 by Bishop England of Charleston); the Truth-teller of New York (founded in 1822); the Catholic Telegraph of Cincinnati (founded by Bishop Fenwick in 1831); the Catholic Herald of Philadelphia (founded by J. Hughes); the Catholic Advocate of Bardstown and the Wahrheits Freund (founded by Rev. M. Henni, subsequently Archbishop of Milwaukee, in 1837). Other periodicals previously started had been suspended. The Boston Pilot was founded in the year of the Third Provincial Council, and the New York Freeman's Journal three years later. The U. S. Catholic Magazine, an ably conducted monthly, was founded in 1842, and was published for seven years. Brownson's Review (series from 1844 to 1864 and from 1873 to 1875), published quarterly, exhibited the great ability and religious loyalty of its editor.

Rev. *John Hughes*[2] of Philadelphia, who had proved himself to be eminent as a pastor, and who had, in his discussions with John Breckinridge, the Presbyterian minister, shown great acuteness of intellect, was, at the recommendation of the Third Council of Baltimore, appointed Coadjutor Bishop of New York. He was consecrated in 1838, became administrator of the diocese in the year following, and on the death of Bishop Dubois, in 1842, succeeded to the office. He successfully repressed lay-trusteeism, the evils of which he had painfully experienced when pastor in Philadelphia, and he caused Catholicity to be respected.

At the FOURTH PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, 1840, thirteen bishops were in attendance. At the request of the prelates the see of Bardstown was transferred to Louisville; and *Richard V. Whelan* was appointed to the see of Richmond, in Virginia, which until then had remained under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Baltimore. The Fathers, as also those of the next council, directed their attention to the important question of Church property.

In May, 1843, sixteen bishops assembled at the FIFTH PROVINCIAL COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE. The council proposed to Rome the erection of the sees of Little Rock, comprising the State of Arkansas and the Cherokee and Choctaw nations in the Indian Territory; of Chicago, for the State of Illinois; of

[1] See *White*, p. 653.

[2] See *Hassard's* Life of Archbishop Hughes. New York, 1866.

Digitized by Google

Hartford, for Connecticut and Rhode Island; of Pittsburg,[1] for western Pennsylvania; and of Milwaukee. Rev. *Andrew Byrne*, appointed to Little Rock, and Rev. *William Quarter*, appointed to Chicago, who had both been pastors in New York City, were there consecrated, together with Rev. *John McCloskey*, coadjutor to Bishop Hughes, on March 10, 1844. *William Tyler*, a member of the Barber family, converted in New Hampshire, became first Bishop of Hartford, the zealous *M. O'Connor* was the first Bishop of Pittsburg, and *M. Henni*, vicar-general of Bishop Purcell, was consecrated Bishop of Milwaukee at the same time that *Ignatius A. Reynolds* was consecrated second Bishop of Charleston.

At the time of the Fifth Council, Oregon, the territory north of California between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific Ocean, had become a fertile field for missionary labor. It was in the year 1840 that the celebrated Jesuit *Peter John De Smet*, one of the young Belgians who had come out to America under the care of Father Nerinckx, went from St. Louis to visit the Flatheads west of the Rocky Mountains, who had repeatedly asked for a missionary, and in the course of a few years established flourishing missions among them and other tribes. A few years previous, two Canadian priests, Rev. *Francis N. Blanchet*, as vicar-general of the Archdiocese of Quebec, and Rev. *Modeste Demers*, had penetrated to the western portion of the territory, and afterwards, assisted by two other priests, had successfully announced the gospel to various tribes. The Holy See, at the application of the Fathers of the Baltimore Council, erected the whole territory into a vicariate, and Blanchet became vicar-apostolic. Three years later the vicariate was formed into an ecclesiastical province: Rt. Rev. Francis N. Blanchet became Archbishop of Oregon City; his brother, Rt. Rev. *A. M. A. Blanchet*, Bishop of Walla-Walla (Nesqualy), and Rt. Rev. M. Demers, Bishop of Vancouver's Island, became his suffragans.

THE SIXTH COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, in 1846, at which twenty-three bishops were present, chose "the Blessed Virgin Mary, conceived without sin," as the patroness of the Church in the United States. At the request of the Fathers, the sees of Buffalo and Albany, in the State of New York, and of Cleveland, in Ohio, were erected. Rev. John Timon, C. M., well known as an eminent missionary in Missouri and Texas, was appointed to the see of Buffalo. Rt. Rev. John McCloskey was appointed to Albany, and Rt. Rev. *Amadeus Rappe* to Cleveland. Rt. Rev. J. M. Odin, C. M., Vicar-Apostolic of Texas from 1842, became in 1847 bishop of this territory, with his see at Galveston. In the same year St. Louis was raised to the rank of a metropolitan see; and the learned Dr. *Peter Richard Kenrick*, Coadjutor of Bishop Rosati from 1841, and his successor in 1843, became first Archbishop of St. Louis.

THE SEVENTH COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE assembled in 1849. Twenty-five bishops were in attendance. The Fathers gave expression to their profound belief in the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and their wish that this doctrine might be proclaimed a dogma of faith. The acts

[1] *Lambing's* Hist. of the Cath. Church in the Dioceses of Pittsburg and Allegheny.

Digitized by Google

of the council were confirmed by the Holy See in 1850. Among these acts was the erection of new dioceses and new metropolitan sees. Bishop Whelan became Bishop of Wheeling (West Virginia), and Rev. *John McGill* was nominated Bishop of Richmond. The see of Walla-Walla was transferred to Nesqualy. Rev. *Francis Xavier Gartland* became first Bishop of Savannah, which comprised the State of Georgia and a portion of Florida. Rev Joseph Cretin, Vicar-General of Dubuque, who had been a zealous missionary in the Northwest, was appointed to the see of St. Paul for the Territory of Minnesota: he was a distinguished promoter of westward immigration. Rev. *Joseph S. Alemany*, O. P., became second Bishop of Monterey, in Upper California, which, like New Mexico, was ceded to the United States in 1848. He thus became the successor of the Rev. *Garcia Diego y Moreno*, O. S. F., who in 1832 had been appointed Prefect of the Indian Missions in California, which had been conducted with encouraging results by members of his order, and in 1840 had been nominated Bishop of both Californias. Rev. *John B. Lamy*, of Ohio, was appointed Vicar Apostolic of the Territory of New Mexico. In 1850 the Indian Territory was made an apostolic vicariate, to which Rev. *John B. Miège*, S. J., was appointed. The two principal missions here were those of the Pottawatomies and of the Osages, which comprised several thousand Indians. The Sisters of the Sacred Heart and the Sisters of Loretto conducted schools for their benefit.

At the request of said council, the dioceses of New York, Cincinnati, and New Orleans were raised to metropolitan rank. There were now six ecclesiastical provinces: —

1. That of Baltimore, embracing the sees of Philadelphia, Pittsburg, Richmond, Wheeling, Charleston, and Savannah.
2. That of Oregon City, embracing the sees of Walla-Walla (Nesqualy) and Vancouver's Island.
3. That of St. Louis, embracing the sees of Dubuque, Nashville, St. Paul, Chicago, and Milwaukee.
4. That of New York, embracing the sees of Boston, Hartford, Albany, and Buffalo.
5. That of Cincinnati, with the sees of Louisville, Detroit, Vincennes, and Cleveland.
6. That of New Orleans, with the suffragan sees of Mobile, Natchez, Little Rock, and Galveston.

The Catholic population, which Irish and German immigration had increased during the last ten years, now amounted to about three millions, with about eighteen hundred priests. The bishops had paid marked attention to the establishment of institutions of learning,[1] both in the secular department and in those for the spiritual training of youth. Many of these were conducted by religious communities.

Besides the orders for men that have been already mentioned, there were

[1] There were twenty-nine ecclesiastical institutions, seventeen colleges, and ninety-one female academies. (*Murray*, p. 260.)

Digitized by Google

now the Benedictines, introduced in 1846 by the Rt. Rev. Abbot-General *Boniface Wimmer*, as also several branches of Franciscans, Trappists, and Redemptorists; the Congregation of the Holy Cross, introduced in 1841 by V. Rev. Father *Sorin;* the Congregation of the Most Precious Blood, introduced in 1844, by Rev. Father *Francis de Sales Brunner;* and the Brothers of the Christian Schools.

In April, 1851, the distinguished prelate Rt. Rev. Archbishop Eccleston departed this life; he was succeeded in the see of Baltimore by the Rt. Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia, who was soon called upon to preside over the

FIRST PLENARY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MAY, 1852,

at which six archbishops and twenty-six bishops were present.

Two months before the opening of the First Plenary Council, the see of Philadelphia, vacant by the departure of Bishop Kenrick, was filled by his esteemed friend, the humble and saintly Redemptorist, Father *John N. Neumann.* He took part in the deliberations of the council,[1] as did also the eminent Coadjutor-Bishop of Louisville, *Martin J. Spalding*, who was afterwards chosen to preside over the Second National[2] Council. The Fathers assembled at Baltimore directed their attention to the subject (at that time most urgent) of the establishment of parochial schools, the importance of which was strenuously advocated by Dr. Spalding.[3] There were as yet comparatively few congregations which enjoyed the benefit of having such schools, that are, generally speaking, indispensably necessary for the preservation of faith and virtue in the Catholic youth of this country, in consequence of the spirit of indifference to religion and of infidelity which is so widely spread in every direction. "We exhort the bishops," the prelates said, "and, considering the very serious evils which commonly follow from a defective training of youth, we beseech them, through the bowels of divine mercy, to see that schools be established in each of the churches in their dioceses." This appeal was in full accordance with the wish of the first bishops of Baltimore and of the Holy See.[4]

III. The plenary council proposed the erection of new dioceses. Accordingly there were established: —

1. The see of Erie, Pennsylvania, with *Josue M. Young*, a distinguished convert, for its first bishop.

2. The see of Covington, separated from that of Louisville, Kentucky, of which *George A. Carrell*, S. J., was the first bishop.

3. The sees of Burlington, Vermont,[5] and of Portland, Maine, separated

[1] Life of Rt. Rev. J. N. Neumann by Rev. *J. A. Berger*, lately translated into English by Rev. *Eugene Grimm*, C. SS. R.

[2] A plenary council is also called national, because it represents several ecclesiastical provinces ordinarily under one civil government. (Pastoral letter of the Second Plenary Council).

[3] See his article on common schools in his "Miscellanea."

[4] See *Darras*, Appendix, p. 661. *O'Kane Murray*, p. 425 sqq.

[5] Cath. Memoirs of Vermont and New Hampshire, by Rt. Rev. *Louis de Goesbriand.*

Digitized by Google

from Boston, with *Louis De Goesbriand* and *David W. Bacon* as their first bishops, respectively.

4. The see of Newark, New Jersey, with *James Roosevelt Bayley*. formerly an Episcopal minister, as its first bishop.

5. The see of Brooklyn, New York, with *John Loughlin*, Vicar-General of New York, as its first bishop.

6. The see of Quincy, Illinois, separated from Chicago, which see was in 1856 transferred to Alton, and *Henry D. Juncker* became its first bishop.

7. The see of Natchitoches, separated from New Orleans, with *Augustus M. Martin* for its first bishop.

8. San Francisco, separated from Monterey, in 1853 became an archiepiscopal see, with Rt. Rev. Joseph S. Alemany as its first archbishop; while the see of Monterey, to which *Thaddeus Amat*, C. M., was appointed, became a suffragan to it.

9. Santa Fé became a suffragan see to St. Louis

Upper Michigan, where flourishing Indian missions existed owing to the ardent zeal of Rev. *Frederic Baraga*,[1] and where, also, in later years numerous immigrants had settled, was formed into a vicariate apostolic, and its renowned missionary was appointed to preside over it. When in 1856 the vicariate was formed into a diocese, he became the bishop. At first the see was at Sault Ste. Marie; and then, from the year 1865, it was transferred to Marquette.

The rapid increase of the Catholic Church in the New World, which was a source of exultation to the faithful, excited the envy and hatred of infidels and sectarians. The visit to this country in 1853 of Archbishop *Bedini*,[2] then papal nuncio at the court of Brazil, gave occasion to those Italian and German revolutionists who had sought safety on our shores, to raise the voice of slander and to organize a formal persecution against the papal envoy as he went on his way in his peaceful mission through the East unto the West. Assisted by the notorious Gavazzi, an ex-Barnabite, they decried the Roman Church, representing it as an intriguing enemy to Protestantism and to American liberty. While the nuncio was courteously received by President Pierce at Washington, and welcomed by Catholics on every side with enthusiastic demonstrations of joy, the whole country was kept in agitation by the infidel and sectarian press. An attempt was made on his life at Cincinnati, which was happily defeated; but a German paper of the city vilified the nuncio in the basest terms. The good prelate endured these vile assaults with magnanimous patience, and concluded his mission in 1854, after having manifested the great interest felt by the Pope and by himself for the growing American Church. But by these events the spirit of fanaticism was fiercely aroused; a coalition

[1] Bishop *Baraga* published a number of works in Indian dialects for the instruction and edification of his beloved children. See *Shea's* History of the Catholic Missions; Cath. Telegraph, February, 1868.

[2] See *Clarke's* Lives of the Deceased Bishops, p. 605 sqq.

Digitized by Google

known as the *Know-Nothings* was formed, to resist, as they said, "the insidious policy of the Church of Rome, and other foreign influences, against the institutions of our country." Like the rioters of ten years preceding, they raised insurrections of the mob, and proceeded to destroy Catholic places of worship. A man named Orr, who called himself the "angel Gabriel," was a prominent leader of this infamous league, which, however, could not hinder the progress of religion, and in fact, by calling men's attention to its claims, furnished the occasion for many to perceive better the character and purposes of Catholicity.

In 1857 the see of Fort Wayne was separated from that of Vincennes, and *J. H. Luers* appointed its first bishop. Upper Michigan became a diocese; the vicariates of Florida and Nebraska were formed: *Augustin Verot* was appointed to the former, and *James O'Gorman* to the latter. In 1860 the vicariate of Marysville, California, was erected, and *Eugene O'Connell* appointed to it. By a decree of July 25, 1858, the primary rank was granted to the incumbent of the archiepiscopal see of Baltimore.

The clamor of civil war, in 1862, rendered it impossible to hold a second national council at that time; the spirit of the Catholic Church, so different from that portrayed by the conduct of sectarian ministers at that period of political excitement, is beautifully explained in the pastoral letter of the Third Provincial Council of Cincinnati, opened in May, 1861.[1] Catholic priests and the Sisters of Charity also found ample opportunity to manifest the spirit of Christian humanity in the self-sacrificing care they bestowed on the sick. During the war the American Church had to mourn the loss of two of her greatest prelates, — that of the renowned theologian the Most Rev. Francis P. Kenrick,[2] Archbishop of Baltimore (+ 1863), and that of the Most Rev. Archbishop Hughes[3] of New York (+ 1864), the sturdy champion of the Catholic cause. The latter was succeeded by Most Rev. J. McCloskey of Albany, while the former see was filled by Rt. Rev. M. J. Spalding,[4] at first Coadjutor-Bishop, and then from 1850 Bishop of Louisville. As apostolic delegate he presided over the

Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, in 1866,

at which were present seven archbishops, thirty-eight bishops, three mitred abbots, fourteen superiors of religious orders, and upwards of one hundred theologians.

[1] *O'Kane Murray*, p. 309.

[2] His works are: Catholic Doctrine of Justification, Primacy of Apostolic See, Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis, Treatise on Baptism and Confirmation, Vindication of Catholic Church, Translation and Annotation of all the Books of the Old and New Testaments.

[3] His works were edited by *L. Kehoe*, New York.

[4] See Rev. *J. L. Spalding*, Life of Archbishop Spalding. He wrote: Evidences of Catholicity, Life of Bishop Flaget, Miscellanea, Sketches of Kentucky, Reviews, Lectures, and Essays, and A History of the Protestant Reformation in Germany and Switzerland.

Digitized by Google

The decrees of this council,[1] which were approved by the Holy See, besides giving a clear exposition of the main doctrines of the Catholic Church and condemning the errors of the time, contain many salutary regulations and admonitions concerning worship, ecclesiastical discipline, and the promotion of religious life. Recapitulating the above-cited words of the First Plenary Council on parochial schools, the Fathers direct all pastors of souls to provide for the establishment of such schools, to be conducted under their own supervision, as the best and almost the only effectual means to meet the evils and dangers to the morals and faith of the generality of Catholic youth, which result from attending the public schools; they also expressed their desire for the establishment of a Catholic university; and they petitioned the Holy Father to erect several new dioceses and vicariates. In fulfilment of this desire, in 1868 were erected in the province of Baltimore the episcopal sees of Wilmington in Delaware, of Scranton, Pennsylvania, of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and the vicariate-apostolic of North Carolina; in the province of Oregon, the vicariate-apostolic of Idaho; in the province of St. Louis, the sees of Green Bay and La Crosse (both in Wisconsin), of St. Joseph in Missouri, the vicariate of Montana, the vicariate-apostolic of Colorado; in the province of Cincinnati, the see of Columbus, Ohio; in the province of San Francisco, the see of Grass Valley, replacing the apostolic vicariate of Marysville; in the province of New York, the see of Rochester. In 1869 the vicariate of Arizona was erected; in the year following, the vicariate of Florida was formed into a see, with its seat at St. Augustine; the see of Springfield, in Massachusetts, was also erected; in 1872 the sees of Ogdensburg, in New York, and of Providence, in Rhode Island. In 1874 the sees of San Antonio and the vicariate of Brownsville were established; in the same year the bishoprics of Philadelphia, Boston, Milwaukee, and Santa Fé were raised to the rank of metropolitans, and the apostolic vicariate of northern Minnesota, with its seat at St. Cloud, was formed.

In 1875 the venerable Archbishop McCloskey, of New York, was created Cardinal by his Holiness Pius IX. In 1876 an apostolic prefecture was assigned to the Indian Territory. In 1877 Peoria was made a bishopric, and the apostolic vicariate of Kansas changed to the episcopal see of Leavenworth; while the see of Alleghany, founded in 1876, was reunited to Pittsburg. In 1879 the vicariate of Dakota was established. In 1880 Kansas City became an episcopal city, and Chicago was raised to the rank of an archbishopric; also, in 1880, the sees of Davenport, Trenton, and Grand Rapids were formed. In 1884 the vicariate of Montana was formed into the diocese of Helena, and in New Hampshire the diocese of Manchester was established.

There are now[2] in the United States 12 ecclesiastical provinces, 54 bishop-

[1] Concilii Pl. Baltimor. II. acta et decreta. Notes on the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, by Rev. *S. B. Smith*, of Seton Hall College.

[2] Statistics according to the Catholic Directory of 1885.

Digitized by Google

rics, 7 apostolic vicariates, 1 prefecture-apostolic, 7,043 priests, 6,626 churches, 907 chapels, 1,895 stations. There are also 9 abbeys: namely, one at St. Vincent's, Pennsylvania, one at St. Meinrad's, Indiana, one at Collegeville, Minnesota, one at Atchison, Kansas, one at Conception, Missouri, and of late one at Newark, New Jersey, and one in Gaston County, North Carolina, — these belong to the Order of St. Benedict; one at Gethsemane, Kentucky, and one at New Melleray, Iowa, belonging to the Order of La Trappe. The number of religious orders of men has increased to about thirty. The Passionists, who are chiefly engaged in giving missions, were introduced into the United States from Rome, in 1853, by Bishop O'Connor of Pittsburg. The Congregation[1] of St. Paul the Apostle at New York was founded by Very Rev. Isaac T. Hecker, 1858. There are, in all, nearly fifty religious orders and congregations of women. The religious orders have brought immeasurable benefits to the Church in this country. The cultivation of science, the instruction and edification of the people, the accomplishment of various works of charity, the training of youth in institutions of higher learning as well as in elementary schools, is to a great extent attributable to them. Several of the religious of both sexes devote themselves to the care of the native Indians.

According to the last report there are 263,000 Indians in the United States; they live in certain districts assigned to them. In the Indian Territory there are 3,180 Catholic Indians, intrusted to the care of French Benedictines; Jesuits and secular priests assist them in their labors. In the vicariate of northern Minnesota there are about 2,000 Indians, tended partly by Benedictine Fathers from White Earth Reservation, partly also by Franciscan Recollects from Superior City, Wisconsin, and by Jesuits from Fort William, Canada. The Jesuits have Indian missions in the vicariate of Idaho, where there are about 800 Catholic Indians. The flourishing Indian missions in the vicariate of Dakota are attended by Benedictines under the direction of Rt. Rev. M. Marty, O. S. B. Jesuits and secular priests attend to several Indian missions in Washington Territory. The Jesuits also have missions in Montana. In the dioceses of La Crosse, Green Bay, and Grand Rapids, the Recollects from St. Louis labor with great zeal at several Indian missions. The priests of the diocese attend the Indian reservations in the archdiocese of Oregon City. Most Rev. C. J. Seghers, who has left the archiepiscopal see of Oregon City to return to the vacant diocese of Vancouver Island, is exerting himself to the utmost for the conversion of the Indians. Archbishop Salpointe, in New Mexico, has about 10,000 Catholic Indians living in twenty pueblos or towns.

[1] To this Congregation we owe the establishment of the "Catholic World," an ably conducted monthly. In place of the famous "Brownson's Quarterly," suspended at the close of 1875, the "American Catholic Quarterly Review" was founded in 1876. Its chief editor is Rt. Rev. *J. A. Corcoran*, D.D., the distinguished theologian and a member of the Faculty of the Seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, at Overbrook, Pa. The number of Catholic weekly journals published in the United States is comparatively great. There is, however, a want of daily papers, which, being truly devoted to the cause of Catholicity, might more strongly counteract the threatening influence of the anti-Catholic and anti-Christian press.

Digitized by Google

Alaska Territory contains 60,000 of the red race as yet unconverted to the faith.

We have already mentioned several ecclesiastical institutions of learning, founded and conducted by regular and secular priests. Others have arisen since the middle of this century. Among these are Mount St. Mary's of the West, at Cincinnati, Ohio, founded by Archbishop Purcell and opened in 1851; the Seminary of St. Francis de Sales, near Milwaukee, founded in 1855, under the patronage of Bishop Henni, by Rev. Dr. Salzmann, and first conducted by Rev. M. Heiss, now Archbishop of Milwaukee; the Seminary of our Lady of Angels, Niagara Falls, New York, founded in 1856 by Rev. J. Lynch, C.M., now Archbishop of Toronto; St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy, New York, founded in 1864 by Archbishop Hughes; the Seminary of the Immaculate Conception, South Orange, New Jersey, connected with Seton Hall College, founded in 1856 by Rt. Rev. J. R. Bayley, at that time Bishop of Newark.

There are now in all 35 diocesan seminaries and houses of study for regulars, 1,597 ecclesiastical students, 83 colleges, 581 academies and select schools. The great works of Christian charity, so far as figures can enumerate them, consist in 272 asylums and 154 hospitals.

The "question of questions," as Murray calls it, "How shall our children be educated without religion or in connection with religion?" has engrossed the earnest attention and intense solicitude of bishops, priests, and intelligent laymen. Though taxed to maintain the State schools where an education without religion is offered, Catholics have, at great sacrifices, built and supported schools of their own. "Without these schools," says Bishop McQuaid, "in a few generations our magnificent cathedrals and churches would remain as samples of monumental folly, — of the unwisdom of a capitalist who consumes his fortune year by year without putting it out at interest or allowing it to increase. The Church has lost more in the past from the want of Catholic schools than from any other cause named by me this evening. The establishment of these schools and their improvement in management and instruction is our surest guarantee of future growth and fixedness."[1] It is estimated that there are now about twenty-five hundred schools, with half a million of scholars. Much indeed has been done; yet there remains much more to do.

Notwithstanding numerous lamentable defections,[2] the Church has largely increased in numbers. "An estimate," says Bishop McQuaid, "that would place our Catholic population at eight millions would not, in my judgment, be far from the truth."

This cheering spread of Catholicity called forth the affectionate interest of Pope Pius IX. for this Church of America, — an interest shared by his illustri-

[1] "The Catholic Church in the United States:" Sermon delivered at the Plenary Council.

[2] Compare "The Losses, Gains, and Hopes of Catholicity in the United States," in Murray's History of the Catholic Church in the United States.

Digitized by Google

ous successor Leo XIII., — a special result of whose solicitude was the convening of the

THIRD PLENARY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE IN 1884.

It was in the fall of 1883 that the American archbishops and their representatives went to Rome, in compliance with the call of Pope Leo XIII., in order to discuss with his Holiness and a committee of cardinals appointed by him, the interests of the Church in this country, and to determine the principal subjects which it would be necessary to discuss in the council to be held in the following year. A schema of these subjects was drawn up and presented to the Pope by the archbishops before they left Rome. Most Rev. James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore (1877), now Cardinal, was appointed Apostolic Delegate to preside over the council. The questions to be discussed were classed under twenty-five distinct headings. The proximate preparations for the council were made under the supreme direction of the apostolic delegate. The principal objects of the proceedings had been already expressed by the Pope when, in December, 1883, the American students at Rome expressed their gratitude in that the North American College had been honored by having the dignity of a Pontifical Institution[1] conferred upon it. The Pope then said that special importance would be given to the following considerations: (1) In regard to the provision and tenure of Church property; (2) The establishment of a more uniform Church government in all the provinces and dioceses, more especially in regard to ecclesiastical discipline, in the management of seminaries, colleges, and schools; (3) A more harmonious co-operation of the Church with the laws of America.

The number of prelates who took part in this august assembly was nearly double that of those who had attended the Second Plenary Council. The members of this council ranked as follows: fourteen archbishops, sixty bishops, five visiting bishops from Canada and Japan, seven abbots, one prefect-apostolic, eleven monsignors, eighteen vicars-general, twenty-three superiors of religious orders, twelve rectors of seminaries, and ninety theologians.[2]

The decrees of the council, which have received the approval of the Holy See, will doubtless prove to bear greatly on the furtherance of the interior life of the Church in the United States as well as on its exterior condition, and may thus inaugurate new prospects for the extension of unworldliness and interior sanctity in this our beloved country.

The Church in Canada, whence so many noble missionaries have gone forth for the conversion of the heathen natives of America, remained true to its renown for apostolic zeal. The labors of the missionaries among the Indians were crowned with success in spite of obstacles.

By a bull of July 12, 1844, Gregory XVI. united the dioceses of

[1] Catholic Review, February, 1885.

[2] Memorial Volume of the Third Plenary Council.

Digitized by Google

Upper and Lower Canada into the province of Quebec, with the suffragan sees of Kingston (founded in 1826), of Montreal (founded in 1836), and of Toronto (founded in 1842). In the course of time new episcopal and metropolitan sees were established. Halifax, already a bishopric in 1845, became a metropolitan see in 1852; Toronto in 1870, and St. Boniface in 1871.

In the Dominion of Canada there are now four ecclesiastical provinces; namely, —

1. The province of Quebec,[1] to which belong the sees of Quebec, Chicoutimi, Montreal, Ottawa, Rimouski, St. Hyacinth, Sherbrooke, Three Rivers, the vicariate-apostolic of Pontiac, the prefecture-apostolic of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

2. The province of Halifax, to which belong the sees of Halifax, Arichat, Charlottetown, Chatham, and St. John.

3. The province of Toronto, to which belong the sees of Toronto, Hamilton, Kingston, London, and Peterborough.

4. The province of St. Boniface, to which belong the sees of St. Boniface, St. Albert, the vicariates-apostolic of Athabaska-Mackenzie and British Columbia.

The dioceses of Newfoundland and of Harbor Grace, with the prefecture-apostolic of St. George's, W. N. F., are directly subject to the Holy See.

The diocese of Vancouver Island belongs to the province of Oregon in the United States.

In regard to education, Canada possesses great advantages, especially in the diocese of Montreal.

According to the "Catholic Almanac" of 1885 there are in said provinces 17 ecclesiastical seminaries, besides 44 colleges and about 3,500 parish schools, although the number of the latter is not stated for all the dioceses.

The Laval University, founded in 1852, is an offshoot from the Seminary of Quebec, established in 1663 by Francis de Laval, first Bishop of Canada.

At Quebec there is a grand seminary and a minor seminary. In the diocese of Montreal, besides the grand seminary, the Sulpitians conduct a number of other institutes of learning; and in addition to the Sulpitians, the Jesuits, the Congregation of the Holy Cross, the Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate, the Clercs de St. Viateur, the Basilian Fathers, and the Christian Brothers devote themselves to the work of education. The French islands at St. Pierre and Miquelon form an apostolic prefecture.

[1] Most Rev. E. A. Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec, was created cardinal in 1886.

Digitized by Google

In Mexico, President Comonfort persecuted the Church vehemently. The property of various religious orders which have done so much for the country was confiscated. The French expedition and the election of the Archduke Maximilian as Emperor of Mexico brought no help to the Catholics; for the new ruler leaned towards the Liberals, who finally delivered him over to destruction. On July 19, 1867, the betrayed monarch was shot at the command of the republican president Juarez (+ 1872). Under him the persecution and plundering of the Church was renewed with increased violence. His successor, Lerdo de Tejada, persecuted alike priests and members of the religious orders; but these proceedings were resisted by the faithful population. The episcopate also stood up resolutely in defence of the rights of the Church.

§ 213. *Missions in Central America, the West Indies, and South America, in Africa and Oceanica.*

The Constituent Assembly of the five States of Central America (Nicaragua, Guatemala, San Salvador, Honduras, and Costa Rica) was, in 1823–1824, animated by a spirit inimical to the Church, which manifested itself in many ways. The dissolution, in 1838, of the bond that united them ameliorated the lot of Catholics in some districts, where the Government concluded a concordat with the Apostolic See, without, however, fulfilling the conditions which had been agreed upon.

The situation of the Church in the republic of Hayti, where political revolutions have inflicted great wounds on her, is most deplorable. In the republic of St. Domingo the condition of religion is no better on that island. Since 1862 the archbishopric of St. Domingo has been vacant; the negroes are falling back into heathenism.[1] In the Spanish Antilles, Cuba, and Porto Rico, and in the apostolic vicariate of Jamaica, religion is in a better condition; but the missions thrive best in the Lesser Antilles, which are under the government of France and England.

Several republics arose in 1820, in what had heretofore been the Spanish provinces of South America; the governments[2] of these are very hostile to the Church. The instigators of the persecutions undergone by the Church were, and still are, the liberal Freemasons, who employ the same means everywhere; plundering the churches,

[1] Acta Pii IX., tom i. p. 559 sqq.

[2] Ibid., tom. i. p. 383 sqq.

Digitized by Google

banishing such priests and monks as are faithful to their duty, raising unecclesiastical and immoral men to positions in the Church, tolerating the shameful calumnies against the Church propagated by an unbelieving and unbridled press.

The Holy See protested against the violation of Church rights by the Government; a portion also of the clergy of those districts resisted the wrong done. The bishoprics remained vacant for years. This miserable state of things was made worse by continual civil wars, which occasioned a fearful return to barbarism. The concordats concluded lately with the Holy See have for the most part not been carried out. The republic of Ecuador under the able and faithful president Gabriel Garcia Moreno, formed a pleasing exception to the general run; in revenge for which the Freemasons had him assassinated on Aug. 6, 1875. After his death the situation of the Church became worse again. On Good Friday, 1877, the Archbishop of Quito was poisoned; on the 17th of October of the same year the Bishop of Guayaquil underwent a like fate.

In the republic of Bolivia existed, on the whole, a good understanding between the Church and the State power. The war with Chili, however, in 1880 led to a plundering of churches. In Peru Masonic liberalism now wages war with the Church. The situation is better in Chili, although conflicts between the Church and the State are not infrequent even here. In the Argentine Republic, Buenos Ayres, and on the Rio de la Plata the Catholic Church had to suffer much from the temporal power. The seducing arts of Protestant missionaries were rendered of no avail by the prevailing faith of the people. In the year 1858 the widowed sees were again filled. The missions of Uruguay and Paraguay were hindered in their progress by the hostility of unbelieving statesmen.

The Government of Brazil, which had been separated from Portugal in 1826, imitated the example of Pombal, but found powerful opposition in the believing people and in the States, who powerfully resisted schismatical efforts. The conflict occasioned by the nomination of the unecclesiastical Dr. Moura to the bishopric of Rio Janeiro ended with the defeat of the Government. The measures taken by the Bishop Don Vital of Olinda, or Pernambuco, against the Freemasons, who had forced themselves even into religious societies, occasioned a violent conflict between the Church and the Masonic Government. The bishops of Olinda and Para were in 1876 condemned to imprisonment, but the other bishops followed

Digitized by Google

the example of their imprisoned co-brothers. The clergy and people bravely and faithfully took their part, and Pope Pius IX. expressly sanctioned the excommunication of Freemasons. The proposed programme of laws inimical to the Church, planned by the minister Rio Branco on June 30, 1876, was not carried out. The Emperor Dom Pedro II. dismissed the ministers, set the imprisoned bishops at liberty, and came to an understanding with the Holy See. Catholic societies have been formed for the preservation of the rights and freedom of the Church. In the year 1878 another liberal ministry again obtained the reins of government.

In Africa the heroic sacrifices made by the missionaries have hitherto been crowned with small success. In the north of this division of the world, which was once the cradle of so many great doctors of the Church, there are now the apostolic vicariate for Tunis, the archbishopric of Algiers (1867), together with the suffragan bishoprics of Oran and Constantine for the French province of Algiers, and the Spanish bishopric of Ceuta for Morocco. In modern times the archbishopric of Carthage has been re-established. The principal merit for the prosperity of the missions accrues to Cardinal Lavigerie.

For the countries of Central Africa Gregory XVI., at the request of the Jesuit Ryllo, erected an apostolic vicariate in 1846. For the support of this mission, which A. Knoblecher (+ 1858) conducted with success, the Sodality of Mary was established in Austria in 1851. The most meritorious bishop Daniël Comboni (+ 1881), who sought "to regenerate Africa by Africa itself," obtained greater results; unhappily, his work is more than temporarily endangered by the insurrections in the Soudan. On the western coast, where in 1854 a mission seminary was established, the priests of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost and of the Immaculate Heart of Mary labor courageously in Senegambia, Sierra Leone, and Gabun, though beset by the difficulties offered by the murderous climate as well as by the stupidity and moral corruption of the natives. The missions of Zambesi since 1880 have been conducted by Jesuits, many of whom have succumbed to the climate and to the hardships they have had to encounter. On Aug. 28, 1860, an apostolic vicariate was established for Dahomey. In Congo also the missions received a fresh impetus. Mgr. Carrie became first bishop of the Congo territory (October, 1886). In Cape Colony there have been erected since 1851 three apostolic vicariates, to which an apostolic prefecture was added in 1874. On the Seychelle Islands missionaries, since 1853, are again at work. A bishopric was founded in 1850, for the Isle of

Digitized by Google

Bourbon. In the island of Madagascar Queen Ranavolana (+ 1861) persecuted the missionaries. In 1863 King Radama II. permitted the Christian religion to be announced. Queen Rasoherina died, as a Catholic, in 1868. Her sister Ranavolana II. adopted Protestantism, which then became the religion of the State. In 1861 Pope Pius IX. erected an apostolic vicariate in Madagascar, over which the zealous Father Jouen (+ 1872) presided. Abyssinia drinks in the sweat of the missionaries, but brings forth no fruit of salvation.

The first missionary in Zanguebar was Father Horner (1867). For Egypt and Arabia the apostolic vicariate of Alexandria was erected in 1837. The exertions of religious communities have effected some results among the Copts; the adherents of Islamism, on the other hand, oppose Christianity with all their might. In the year 1867 two institutes were founded in Cairo for the unfortunate negroes, who were brought as slaves to Egypt from the interior of Africa. Similar establishments have been opened for the reception and Christian education of poor negro children.

The missions in Oceanica are making good progress in spite of the unworthy measures taken by the Methodists; in spite also of the savage nature of the inhabitants, who are cannibals. On the whole, the faith is spreading. In the year 1844 it was found practicable to hold a provincial synod in Sidney. The missions on the Gambier Islands are very flourishing. Besides the Benedictines and Jesuits the Marian Priests[1] and the priests of the Picpus Society labored in this part of the world, in which also the blood of martyrs was poured forth. Since the year 1874 two ecclesiastical provinces, Sidney and Melbourne, have been established in Australia;[2] Polynesia has three bishoprics and eight apostolic vicariates.

§ 214. *Missions in Turkey and Persia.*

In spite of the enmity of the fanatical Moslems, of the artifices of schismatics, and of the intrigues of Russia, the Catholic religion maintained itself in the Turkish Empire, and daily gains new mem-

[1] The Marian Priests, or Marists, of Lyons were founded in 1815 by E. de Mazenod, subsequently Bishop of Marseilles (+ 1861), and approved by Leo XII. The Congregation of Picpus (so called from the street of Paris in which the head monastery is situated), or of the Heart of Jesus and Mary, was founded in 1805 by the venerable Coudrin.

[2] The first Australian Plenary Council was opened in the Cathedral of Sydney on Nov. 15, 1885, by his Eminence Cardinal Moran.

Digitized by Google

bers. Many religious orders — as the Benedictines, Franciscans, Capuchins, Jesuits, Lazarists, Passionists (founded by St. Paul of the Cross, + 1775) — were very active missionaries among them; their efficiency was much enhanced by the labors of the Sisters of Charity among the sick and in giving instruction to the young. The Porte has somewhat abated the rigor of its system of persecution; yet oppression of the Christians has not altogether ceased, notwithstanding the Hatti-Scherif of Gülhane on Nov. 3, 1839, and the Hatti-Humayum (Toleration Edict) of 1856. In July, 1860, the fearful massacre of Christians in Lebanon and Syria took place. Even the visit of the Sultan Abdul Aziz, in 1867, to many European courts, appears to have in no way improved the situation of Christians. When in 1870 a very insignificant portion of the united Armenians renounced obedience to the Patriarch Hassun, the Porte took the part of the schismatics, acknowledged their Patriarch Kupelian, and bestowed on him the Church property of the Catholic Armenians.[1] It was not till 1874 that they tolerated the "Hassunists," and even then it was without restoring to them their rights and their possessions.

In the kingdom of Greece there are eight bishoprics, with about thirty thousand Catholics.

In the Levant the Lazarists performed their labors under the protection of Austria and France. The apostolic vicariate of Aleppo embraces the Catholics of the Latin rite in Syria and Phœnicia, from which Egypt in 1837 and Abyssinia in 1843 became detached. In the year 1847 the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem again took up his residence in the Holy City. The Franciscans, who have twenty-two convents in Palestine,[2] still keep watch around the Holy Sepulchre; they have often to suffer severely from unseemly acts at the hands of the schismatics. The Association of the Holy Sepulchre, founded at Cologne in 1855, has been of great advantage. The institutions of learning founded by the Jesuits at Gazir (a seminary) and at Beirut are of great importance.

Through the influence of France the Catholic missionaries obtained in Persia the restoration of their churches and protection against their enemies. In 1834 the Shah issued a firman securing protection to Father Deuberia, Superior of the Armenian mission.

[1] Kupelian returned penitently to the Church in 1879. Hassun was created Cardinal by Leo XIII. in 1880. He died in 1884. Pope Leo XIII. has founded an Armenian seminary in Rome.

[2] The institutions founded by Alphonse Ratisbonne (+ 1884) are very successful.

Digitized by Google

Eugene Boré erected a mission house in western Persia. On Oct. 7, 1875, Pius IX. received the ambassador of the Shah in the Vatican at a solemn audience; the latter presented a letter from his master, and informed the Pope that the Shah had commanded his officials to permit the free exercise of the Catholic religion in Persia.

The ancient Oriental sects, — the Chaldeans, the Syrians, the Maronites, the Armenians, the Greco-Melchites, etc., — who have returned to union with Rome, have their own patriarchs, whose rights and privileges have been reaffirmed by the Apostolic See. The schism occasioned by J. Audu (+ 1878), Patriarch of the Chaldeans, was announced by Pope Leo XIII. in April, 1879, as being finally ended.

The greatest merit regarding the missions belongs to France, which sends out the largest number of the preachers of the gospel, contributes to the establishment and preservation of the missions more than any other nation, and notwithstanding her anti-ecclesiastical government, exercises up to this present time a protectorate over the missions.

A shameful assault upon the missions has been made in our own time by the revolutionary government in Italy, which has not scrupled to deprive the Propaganda of its property; and while adverting to this subject it may not be amiss to remark that the Catholics of North America, with whom many Protestants have on this subject united, have remonstrated in so energetic a manner against the proposed act of violence in regard to their own American College of the Propaganda at Rome, that the Government of the United States interposed its intercession, and it has been spared to them.

Besides the College of the Propaganda, which is the greatest missionary establishment in the world, there are other institutes devoted to the training of missionaries: these are St. Lazare and the Seminary of St. Esprit, at Paris; the College of All Hallows, near Dublin, Ireland; St. Joseph's College, at Mill Hill, for negro missions, near London, England; and the Chinese College at Naples.

The Protestant missionary societies in London (1795), Boston (1810), Basel (1816), Berlin (1823), Barmen, and others, have the disposal of considerable sums of money, yet attain but slight results. Nor do the Bible Societies in London (1804) and in Berlin (1816) effect their object, although they yearly send out millions of Bibles in every tongue to heathen lands. Morrison labored in China (1807) and Gützlaw (1829), yet on the whole without success. The hopes which the Protestants placed on the religio-

OF THE

Digitized by Google

political movement (Tae-ping, *i. e.* Universal peace) which arose in China in 1850, were not realized. In India the English even countenanced idolatry. Some Anglican bishoprics were erected, but the number of the neophytes is inconsiderable.

The Methodists had more success in Madagascar. There are Protestant missions also in Oceanica, particularly in Tahiti, in the Society and Friendly Islands. Livingstone, a Scotchman, by his discoveries in Africa enriched science, but displayed no great energy as a missionary. The Anglo-Prussian bishopric of St. James at Jerusalem, founded in 1841, at Bunsen's suggestion, by King Frederic William IV. of Prussia, and Howley, Archbishop of Canterbury, and endowed with £38,000 sterling, called forth protestations, both in England and Prussia, against this "mixed marriage." It acquired no practical importance, and was suppressed in 1883.

On Protestant work in Italy and Spain, see §§ 224, 225. On Protestant missions, see *Browne*, History of the British and Foreign Bible Society, from its institution in 1804 to the close of its Jubilee, 1854. 2 vols. London, 1859.

II. CHURCH AND STATE.

§ 215. *Influence of the French Revolution on Ecclesiastical Affairs.*

The Revolution had long been preparing in France, (*a*) by the revolutionary principles of the Huguenots, which were brought to bear in the political sphere as well as in that of religion; (*b*) by the royal absolutism which had been formed in conflict with these principles; (*c*) by the moral, or rather the immoral corruption of the higher classes; (*d*) by the godless writings of the atheistic philosophers; (*e*) by the unaccountable carelessness of the Government; and (*f*) by the turning of men's brains, occasioned by the freedom-mania that followed the American war for liberty. All these things had conspired to produce the event, which broke out in the reign of the noble-hearted but weak-minded King Louis XVI., and was accompanied by the most disastrous results, not only for the throne, but for the altar.

The proximate occasion of this sad catastrophe[1] was the convoca-

[1] See interesting details in Collection des mémoires sur la révolution française. 41 vols. Paris, 1821 sqq. *Barruel*, Collection ecclésiastique ou recueil des ouvrages faits depuis l'ouverture des états généraux relativement au clergé. 7 vols. Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la persécution française recueillies par les ordres de Pie VI. par l'abbé *d'Hesmivy d'Auribeau*. 2 vols. Rom. 1794. *Jervis* (Anglican), The Gallican Church and the Revolution. London, 1882.

Digitized by Google

tion of the States General, called forth by the deplorable condition of the finances. The Estates met at Versailles (May 4, 1789), and on the motion of the Abbé Sieyès and Count Mirabeau declared themselves to be the Constituent National Assembly, and as such entered into the most violent opposition against both the throne and the Church. The anti-ecclesiastical spirit of the majority of this assembly had been already manifested in the proclamation of the Rights of Man and of religious liberty (August 26), as proposed by Lafayette. The contest raged still more vehemently at Paris, whither the National Assembly, now governed by Freemasons, had followed the unfortunate king on the 6th of October.

On November 2, all ecclesiastical property was, on the motion of Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, placed at the disposal of the nation, which in future was to provide for the requirements of religious worship. An armed and paid mob suppressed all opposition.

Some weeks later, on Feb. 13, 1790, a decree was passed, on the motion of the lawyer Treillard, which suppressed all the religious orders in France and interdicted solemn monastic vows. The expelled monks were to receive pensions, but the nuns were still allowed to dwell in their convents.[1]

In order to un-Catholicize France more thoroughly, the so-called "Civil Constitution of the Clergy" was adopted by the National Assembly, July 12, 1790. After the insurgents had, on August 24, extorted the royal signature to this measure, they demanded, on the motion of the Protestant Barnave, on Jan. 4, 1791, that the clergy should take the oath of the Civil Constitution. Very few of the clergy complied with this demand. On April 13, Pope Pius VI. condemned the Civil Constitution. In revenge for this, the National Assembly, which, on April 4, had converted the church of St. Genévieve into a Pantheon, declared that the papal provinces of Avignon and Venaissin were annexed to France (September 14).

The frustrated attempt at flight made on June 25 by the king, who too late discovered the significance and tendency of the events passing around him, facilitated the iniquitous work of the Revolution. The Constituent Assembly closed its sessions on Sept. 30, 1791. It was replaced by the Legislative Assembly, in which the Jacobins had the upper hand. The oath to the Civil Constitution was, on a motion of François de Neufchateau (November 29),

[1] Prat. Essai hist. sur la destruction des ordres relig. en France au 18 siècle. Paris, 1845.

Digitized by Google

extended to all the clergy, and those refusing to take it were to be condemned to perpetual banishment.

The wearing of the ecclesiastical dress was forbidden (April 2, 1792). Divorce was legalized. A cruel persecution of the Catholic priests followed. The king himself was imprisoned.

When the National Convocation was established on Sept. 20, 1792, it assumed the government and proclaimed the republic. The king was beheaded Jan. 21, 1793. Under the direction of Robespierre, Marat, Danton, and others, a most barbarous method of persecution was carried on. Among the victims were three hundred priests, including the venerable archbishop Dulau of Arles, then eighty-seven years old; the two brothers La Rochefoucauld, bishops of Beauvais and Saintes; Montmorin, formerly Minister of State and superior of the Eudists; Hebert, confessor to King Louis XVI.; the Princess de Lamballe; etc.

Already, on June 14, 1790, the Protestants of Nismes and the region around had murdered three hundred Catholics of that city, had plundered and destroyed Catholic churches and cloisters, and had exercised the greatest cruelty. And now revolutionary tribunals and committees of public safety ("comités du salut public") were organized everywhere, which, by means of forty-four thousand guillotines and a flying column of six thousand soldiers, were to purify France from all aristocratic elements. Even the vile and worthless Duke of Orleans, Philippe Egalité, whose intention it was to ascend the throne of France, for which purpose he had joined the Revolution, perished by the guillotine, Nov. 6, 1793.

The Convention pursued its course, more and more intent on unchristianizing France. The Gregorian Calendar was abolished on Oct. 5, 1793, and replaced by the Republican Calendar composed by the mathematician Romme, in which decades were introduced instead of weeks. The cathedral of Notre Dame and the other churches were desecrated by orgies in honor of the Goddess of Reason. This example was imitated in the provinces. The heroic inhabitants of La Vendée (Anjou, Poitou, and Bretagne), who on March 10, 1793, had arisen in behalf of religion and royalty, succumbed indeed to the overpowering force of the Revolution, but not without winning for themselves (February, 1795) freedom of religious worship. The senseless worship of Reason, was, however, of short duration. Its author, Anacharsis Cloots, and his followers, were beaten in the strife between their party and that of Robespierre, who, after their execution on March 24, had a decree passed,

Digitized by Google

on May 7, 1794, recognizing the existence of a Supreme Being (Être suprême) and the immortality of the soul.

After the fall of Robespierre (July 28, 1794) the Reign of Terror ceased; but the persecution of the Church continued, in spite of the edicts of Feb. 21 and May 30, 1795. The Convention dissolved itself on October 26. "The Council of the Five Hundred" and "The Council of the Elders" took its place. The executive power was in the hands of the Directory. The condition of Catholics was in no way improved by this. If the Edict of Aug. 24, 1797, recalled the banished priests, the Revolution of September 4 banished them anew or brought them death; the constitutional bishops meanwhile enjoyed freedom. The Protestants were also unmolested, and the deistic sect of Theophilanthropists enjoyed the peculiar favor of the Directory. After Napoleon Bonaparte had become First Consul the prospects of the Catholic Church seemed better.

The French Revolution provoked similar movements in other countries. After the victorious campaign of Napoleon in Upper Italy, the French Government declared war against the Holy See. Pius VI., on June 25, 1796, concluded an armistice with Napoleon, and after the unsuccessful alliance with Naples, he agreed to the Treaty of Tolentino, which was so very prejudicial to the Holy See (Feb. 19, 1797). Joseph, the brother of the consul, was sent to Rome as ambassador of the republic. His house was the place of assembly for all revolutionists. Now began the agitation against the Papal Government. A street mob, purposely incited, in which the French General Duphot was killed, eventually occasioned General Berthier to march into Rome on Feb. 10, 1798, and on the 15th to proclaim Rome a republic. The Pope was carried as prisoner to Siena, thence to be transferred to Florence, and thence to Valence, where he closed the days of his troubled life on Aug. 29, 1799.

On the 1st of December thirty-five cardinals went into conclave[1] at Venice, and on May 14, 1800, elected Barnabas Chiaramonti (Pius VII.) Pope. Under the patronage of the allied powers he returned to Rome. The dignity of Secretary of State was conferred on Cardinal Hercules Consalvi.

[1] On the conclave, namely, on the intrigues of the Cardinal *Herzan*, see the Memoirs of Consalvi. Paderborn, 1870. *Artaud*, Hist. du Pape Pie VII. 2 vols. Paris (3d ed.), 1839. *Crétineau-Joly*, L'église en face de la révolution, i. 243 sqq. *Robiano*, Continuation de l'histoire ecclés. du *Berault-Bercastel*. 4 vols. Paris, 1836.

Digitized by Google

§ 216. *Restoration of Ecclesiastical Order in France.— Concordat of* 1801.—*Napoleon and Pope Pius VII.*

To check the horrors of the Revolution, the First Consul entered into negotiations with Pius VII. with the view of concluding a concordat. At first this threatened to be a failure on account of the immoderate demands of France, till, at the request of Bonaparte, Consalvi came in person to Paris, and after great difficulties concluded the Concordat of July 15, 1801,[1] by which the Church made great concessions to the French Republic. The publication of this concordat followed on Easter Sunday, April 18, 1802.

The joy of the Pope at the restoration of religious worship in France was very soon disturbed by the opposition offered to the concordat. The turmoil was increased by the refusal of some of the "ancient" bishops to resign their sees. In a brief of Aug. 15, 1801, Pope Pius VII. had called upon them to do this. There were from eighty-one to eighty-four of them then living. Of these, forty-five immediately complied with the papal command; thirteen bishops who were living in England addressed a remonstrance to the Pope in common. It was in vain that Pius VII. sought to change their dispositions by writing to them with his own hand on the 11th of November. On April 6, 1803, the "Réclamations canoniques et respectueuses" appeared, which was signed by the above thirty-six bishops. In these also some of the articles of the concordat were attacked. Against the "Réclamations," Barruel wrote his pamphlet "du Pape et de ses droits religieux à l'occasion du Concordat."[2] The bishops in the countries on the left bank of the Rhine, which had been conquered by France, were also obliged to vacate

[1] The first article permitted public worship on condition of conforming to such regulations of the police as public safety might demand in the judgment of the Government ("en se conformant aux règlements de police, que le gouvernement jugera nécessaires pour la tranquillité publique"). This article caused the most difficulty in making the arrangements. Art. 2 stipulates a new diocesan division, diminishing the bishoprics from one hundred and thirty-five to sixty. (Art. 3.) The Pope undertakes to induce those who have been bishops hitherto to resign their sees. Government endows neither the cathedral nor the seminaries. (Art. 11.) The possessors of the confiscated Church property are to remain in undisturbed possession of the same. (Art. 13.) The First Consul retains the same rights and prerogatives as the old Government. (Art. 16.) To him belongs the nomination of the bishops. (Arts. 4 and 5.) When the First Consul is not a Catholic, a new agreement shall be made regarding his rights and the nomination of bishops, etc.

[2] Cf. *Barruel*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclés. iii. 428 sqq.

Digitized by Google

their places. Among them was Cardinal von Frankenberg, Archbishop of Mechlin. The fifty-nine constitutional bishops were simply told that they had lost their places. On June 29, 1801, they had held what they termed a second national synod under Grégoire.[1]

There were many clergymen also who were opposed to the concordat; and in some places resistance thereto led even to schism. But still more injurious than this enmity to the concordat were the seventy-seven "Organic Articles" annexed to it by Bonaparte, which restored Gallicanism to its pristine state, and cancelled several important provisions of the concordat. The protest of the Holy See against those articles produced no effect whatever.

On May 8, 1804, the Senate proclaimed Napoleon Emperor, and the latter requested Pius VII. to crown him in Paris. Louis XVIII., afterwards king, protested against it; and many courts, besides some cardinals, tried to dissuade the Pope from accepting the invitation. Nevertheless, having the good of religion at heart, Pius VII. set out for Paris, where on the 2d of December the coronation took place, in which the Pope only performed the anointing. Napoleon set the crown on his own head. In his many interviews with the emperor, the Pope obtained some few concessions, but could not induce him to revoke the "Organic Articles" and to restore the legations.[2] On April 4, 1805, Pius VII. left Paris.

From this time forward the relation of Napoleon to the Holy See became less and less friendly. The emperor, it is true, did a good deal for the Church, but for his services he claimed complete dominion over her. The Holy See was to be entirely subservient to his interests.

The occupation of the harbor of Ancona by French troops, and the desire expressed by Napoleon, 1806, that the Pope should regard the enemies of the emperor as foes to himself, prepared the rupture which was soon to take place. On Pius VII.'s refusing to accede to these and to several other demands,[3] — such as breaking the marriage between his brother Jerome and Miss Patterson, acknowledging his brother Joseph as King of Naples, closing the havens to the

[1] Cf. Actes du second Concile national de France. 3 vols. Paris, 1801.

[2] The States of the Church were divided into eighteen legations, or delegations, which had been seized by Napoleon.

[3] Cf. Allocutio *Pii VII.*, habita in consistorio diei 16 Martii, 1808. Monach. 1871. Compare also Memoirs of Consalvi and Pacca, and *Michel*, L'église cath. et l'empereur Napoleon I. Paris, 1865. *D'Haussonville*, L'église Romaine et le premier empire. 5 vols. Paris, 1870.

Digitized by Google

enemies of the emperor, recognizing Talleyrand as Prince of Benevento, Bernadotte as Prince of Ponte Corvo, etc.,—on the Pope's demurring to proposals such as these, General Miollis, by order of Napoleon, entered Rome, Feb. 2, 1808; the eminent cardinals were banished, and the Pope subjected to gross outrages. Finally, on May 17, 1809, an imperial edict, dated from Vienna, was published, by which the remainder of the States of the Church were annexed to the French Empire.

Pius VII. replied by the bull of excommunication "Quum memoranda," and a special protest, but was taken prisoner by General Radet in the Quirinal, and, accompanied by his Secretary of State, Cardinal Pacca, was brought to Grenoble. Pacca was afterwards imprisoned in the fortress of Fenestrella, while the Pope had to stay at Savona.

The cardinals were likewise obliged to leave Rome and repair to Paris. Through their influence Napoleon hoped to change the mind of the Pope. He deceived himself. The Pope remained firm, and Napoleon could not obtain his wishes; the Pope would not consent to give up the States of the Church, nor to confirm the newly appointed bishops; neither would he yield in the other matters. At the proposal of the Ecclesiastical Commission appointed by the emperor, the latter convoked a National Council at Paris, while at the same time he negotiated with the Pope. Pius VII. partly complied with the demands then made by Napoleon, promised to confirm the election of the bishops nominated, and to add a clause to the concordat concerning the canonical institution of the bishops, but would not sign the four articles drawn up by the deputation.

On June 17, 1811, the National Council was opened by Cardinal Fesch, Archbishop of Lyons. Gaspar Maximilian, Baron of Droste-Vischering, Suffragan Bishop of Münster, and other prelates proposed that they should, in the first place, demand the liberation of the Pope; but the motion was opposed by the court prelates. After a spirited and lengthy debate an address to the emperor was drawn up. The emperor, being informed of what had happened, refused to receive the address; he was still more indignant when the council declared itself incompetent to resolve the main question before it,—that is, how to procure the canonical installation in office of the bishops appointed by the emperor when the Pope refused to issue the bulls. The president prorogued the sessions, and Napoleon imprisoned the most courageous of the bishops at Vincennes. On this, the council was reopened on the 5th of August. The assembled

Digitized by Google

prelates accepted the five articles proposed by the emperor: these articles were, (1) That a bishop's see shall not remain vacant longer than a year; (2) The emperor shall nominate the bishops for the vacant sees, and beg the Pope to confirm the nominations; (3) This shall take place within six months; (4) When the Pope does not confer canonical institution, the metropolitan or the oldest bishop shall do it after the lapse of six months; (5) The present decree is to be laid before the Pope for his approval.

A deputation then went to Savona to obtain the papal consent. The Pope thus besieged, being deserted by his counsellors and pressed by the *red cardinals*,[1] especially by Roverella, to obviate greater evils, gave his conditional assent, expressly stipulating that the installation by the hands of the metropolitan, to be canonical, must be performed in the name of the Pope alone ("expresso nomine summi pontificis"). He then wrote to Napoleon, who, however, would neither accept the brief nor answer the Pope's letter.

Once more an attempt to obtain larger concessions from the Pope was made by four members of the deputation. Pius VII. remained firm, and could by no means be prevailed upon to consent fully to the emperor's wishes. On October 20 the council was dissolved.

During the Russian campaign Napoleon had the sick Pope brought to Fontainebleau. At the Convent of the Cistercians on Mont Cenis, Pius had received the last sacraments; but, notwithstanding his weakness, he was compelled to continue his journey, and finally arrived at Fontainebleau, June 20, 1812. Only the red cardinals and the court prelates had permission to see him.

After the defeat of the French army in Russia, Napoleon again opened negotiations with the Pope. On Jan. 19, 1813, the emperor appeared personally at Fontainebleau, and extorted from the Pope eleven articles, preliminary to a new concordat. These were signed January 25. The black cardinals now regained their freedom, and went to the Pope.

On their remonstrance Pius VII. recalled his concessions; the emperor, however, had the preliminary articles promulgated as concordat and law of the empire. The victories obtained by the allied forces over Napoleon prevented the outbreak of new contests. The Pope was brought to Savona on Jan. 23, 1814, and set at liberty

[1] Napoleon forbade thirteen cardinals to wear the purple. They were therefore called the *black cardinals*. The reason for the prohibition was, outside of the emperor's personal dislike to them, their refusal to assist at the wedding ceremonial of Napoleon with Maria Louisa, Archduchess of Austria, in April, 1810.

Digitized by Google

in March. On May 24, Pius VII. made his triumphal entry into Rome; while his oppressor, first at Elba, and after the one hundred days' reign, at St. Helena, had ample time and opportunity to reflect on the promises which Christ gave to His Church.

§ 217. *The Catholic Church in Germany.—Secularization.*

The consequences of the French Revolution were also sorely felt by the Church in Germany. Her possessions on the left bank of the Rhine were made over to France, while those on the right bank of that river were secularized. According to the seventh article of the Treaty of Lunéville (1801), those hereditary princes who were in this way compelled to cede territories were to receive indemnification "within the bosom of the empire."

Notwithstanding the protests of several spiritual princes of the empire, this treaty was approved by the diet and the emperor (March 7 and 9), and a commission was appointed, consisting of eight members, which was to regulate the matter of indemnity. This commission, however, soon found that it had simply to submit to the dictates of the Russian and French governments, or rather to those of the First Consul himself. Therefore, in order to secure their portion of the spoils, Prussia, on the 22d of May, and Bavaria, on the 24th of the same month, concluded separate treaties with France.

By the Resolutions of the Deputation of the Empire (1803), which were approved by the emperor, all spiritual principalities were abolished, and both the secular and *ecclesiastical* possessions, as also the possessions of the ancient cathedral chapters and the revenues of the prince bishops, were assigned to the temporal princes as indemnity for their losses. The metropolitan rights of Mentz were alone maintained, and these were transferred to Ratisbon.

By the thirty-fifth article of the Resolutions of the Deputation, "all property belonging to the foundations, abbeys, and monasteries was committed to the free and full disposal of the respective rulers who were to provide for the expense of public worship, of instruction, of founding useful public institutions, and of *lightening their own financial embarrassments.*"

As most of the secularized territories passed to the dominion of Protestant rulers, the belongings of the Catholic Church were thus given up to the arbitrary will of persons who did not recognize her rights; the advisers of these new rulers effected the disposal, in a

Digitized by Google

most sacrilegious manner, of every article belonging to the Church, the altar, and the service of God; nay, many officers exhibited a ruthlessness that would not have been exceeded by the Vandals.

Notwithstanding the solemn declaration made to the deputation in the recess of the empire (Art. 63), that the relations of Church and State should remain the same, the temporal government arrogated to itself the government of ecclesiastical affairs, and made the most alarming encroachments on Church rights and on Church property. The new owners of this property neither complied with the obligations they had entered into to endow the new bishoprics, the cathedral chapters, etc., nor made any preparations to negotiate with the Holy See concerning any new organization of Church affairs. The old dioceses gradually lost their pastors, and the cathedral chapters died out, so that the Pope was obliged to intrust the direction of the bishoprics to vicars-apostolic. These, however, possessed neither the necessary knowledge of the actual state of affairs, nor authority sufficient to check the arbitrary caprices of the rulers.

The dissolution of the German Empire in 1806, in consequence of the Confederation of the Rhine, increased the difficulties of the Church. The Apostolic See now sought to negotiate with the separate governments which had thus become independent of each other.

The negotiations concerning a concordat entered into with Bavaria in 1807 were frustrated by the exorbitant demands of the Government, which was under the influence of the minister Montgelas. The papal nuncio della Genga, Archbishop of Tyre, found less difficulty in Würtemberg; but the intervention of Napoleon, who availed himself of the ecclesiastical affairs in Germany to bring the most unjust reproaches against the Pope, prevented the agreement from being concluded. The proposition of Baron Dalberg, Archbishop of Ratisbon, to have the French Concordat introduced into the States of the Rhine Confederation did not receive the emperor's assent. The subsequent captivity of the Pope put off the adjustment of Church affairs for a long period.

The hopes which the Catholics cherished in regard to the Congress of Vienna (1814)[1] were not destined to be fulfilled. The demands of the "Orators" and the memorial of the Baron of Wessenberg (Nov. 27, 1814) were alike unheeded. Cardinal Consalvi, who desired the restoration of the German Empire and of the ecclesiastical

[1] *Klüber*, Acts of the Congress of Vienna.

Digitized by Google

principalities, could do nothing besides protest against the decisions so injurious to the Catholic Church that were adopted (June 14, 1815). Pius VII., in his allocution of September 4, did the same thing. In fact, the condition of affairs was not essentially improved by the subsequent concordats. The revolutionary year of 1848 rendered a somewhat freer action of the Church possible; but so much the more were the anti-ecclesiastical statesmen and majorities obtained by the Protestant Liberals in the legislative departments intent on enslaving the Church anew.

The projects of the political bureaucratists were greatly forwarded by such ecclesiastics as were imbued with Febronian views respecting the relation that ought to exist between Church and State; such were Wessenberg, Koch, Kopp, and others, who thought to found a "National Church," which was to be independent of Rome, but subject to the arbitrary will of the State governments. The false reformers were opposed by other more soundly minded clergymen; though among these little help came from the vacillating and double-dealing Baron of Dalberg, who, on the contrary, countenanced their views.[1]

In Bavaria, where the Protestants enjoyed the special favor of the Government, and where advocates of quite rationalistic tendencies, such as Paulus, Jacobi, and Niethhammer were raised to positions of honor, the Catholic Church was in a lamentable position; this was owing in great measure to the adverse influence of the minister Montgelas, one of the Illuminati. The Government arrogated to itself the direction of the internal affairs of the Church, the training and appointment of the clergy, the holding of religious services and devotions; it demanded the "Placet" for episcopal circulars, removed the members of the religious orders and other able men from the universities, commanded Protestant preachers to bless mixed marriages when Catholic pastors refused to do it, etc. Pius VII., in a brief to the Electoral Prince Maximilian, as early as Feb. 12, 1803, makes bitter complaints of the ridicule cast on the Holy Cross by the students of the university, of which no notice had been taken by the authorities.[2] This university had been transferred from Ingolstadt to Landshut, and had degenerated into a place of unbelief and immorality.

Ecclesiastical affairs were in a similar position in Tyrol when it came under Bavarian rule in 1806. The same may be said of Würtemberg, where Werkmeister espoused the interests of the Illuminati; of Baden, where the Catholic subjects were treated so intolerantly that it called forth the protest of Napoleon himself, in his capacity of Protector of the Confederation, while unworthy clergymen, under the influence of the Baron of Wessenberg, Vicar-General of

[1] For German literature on the condition of ecclesiastical affairs in Germany, see the original of *Brück*, 3d edition, p. 795 sqq.

[2] Cf. *Roskovány*, Monum. Cath. ii. 80 sqq.

Digitized by Google

Constance, Coadjutor to the Prince-Primate Dalberg, were working injuriously to the interests of the Church by their neological tendencies.

During the rule of the French, Joseph Louis Colmar (+ Dec. 15, 1818) governed the diocese of Mentz with great success, while L. Bruno Lieberman, as rector of the theological seminary and of the episcopal colleges, successfully resisted the innovations of infidelity and neology. Things changed for the worse under Hessian rule, during the vacancy of the see, till 1830. Koch, subsequently an apostate, was counsellor of the Government of Nassau. The Catholic territories which in course of time were annexed to Prussia had a bitter experience of the personally hostile disposition of the princes and of the intolerance of their ministers, as shown by their numerous encroachments on the possessions of the Church and by their intermeddling with the internal discipline and organization of ecclesiastical affairs. Prussian *tradition* affirms "THAT THE STATE IS THE LAWFUL RULER OF THE CHURCH, THE CHURCH BEING BUT ITS MAID-SERVANT." (See § 219.)

§ 218. *The Catholic Church in Bavaria under Maximilian Joseph I. and Louis I.*

After the withdrawal of the minister Montgelas (Feb. 2, 1817), a concordat[1] was finally agreed upon, on June 5, 1817, between Bavaria and the Holy See, which King Maximilian Joseph I. signed on October 24. In spite of the great concessions[2] made by the Pope, this concordat met with great opposition from the enemies of the Church, under the lead of Anselm of Feuerbach, the president of the Government in Ansbach; and the Government itself partly withdrew its agreement therefrom, by some articles of the Constitution and the so-called Second Edict of Religion.[3] The Pope protested against the violation of the concordat, and the clergy refused to take the oath to the constitution until the king (Sept. 15, 1821) made a declaration which theoretically removed all difficulties; yet, in point of fact, the Government made no preparations to fulfil the obligations they had contracted, nor to give up their system of oppression. The concordat stood on the paper; but the Second Edict, so greatly Protestant in spirit and drift, maintained its ground until the death of the weak king on Oct. 12, 1825.

[1] The concordats are in *Nussi*, Conventiones, p. 146 sqq. *Walter*, Fontes, p. 204 sqq.

[2] The Holy See was satisfied with the endowment of the bishoprics and the erection of some few convents as compensation for the secularization, and conferred on the king the right to nominate the bishops and to fill two thirds of all benefices.

[3] *Walter*, l. c. p. 213 sqq.

Digitized by Google

His son and successor, Louis I., to whom the celebrated Görres addressed such touching words of admonition, entertained good dispositions towards the Church; but notwithstanding the personal good-will of the king, who sought to comply, at least to some extent, with the provisions stipulated for in the concordat, it was not until 1837, when Abel was nominated prime minister, that a change for the better ensued. The troubles at Cologne exercised great influence on King Louis, who then proved himself to be a "protector and guardian of the Church." Several unecclesiastical regulations were now suppressed; and on May 25, 1841, free intercourse with Rome was permitted to the bishops.

For the encouragement of Catholic learning, the king invited the most celebrated Catholics of the day, Görres (1827), Phillips (1833), Möhler (1835), Klee (1838), and others to the University of Munich, at which place also the ablest of the native doctors of learning were stationed; and by the erection of splendid churches, and by the restoration of the ancient and venerable cathedrals of Ratisbon, Bamberg, and Spire, Louis I. not only displayed his taste for art, but gave evidence of his own personal piety. His choice of men for filling the episcopal sees ever fell on persons of the greatest merit, and yet neither he nor his ministers could quite come to the resolution of completely surrendering their politico-ecclesiastical theories.

The friendly relations between Louis I. and the Catholic Church were somewhat disturbed by the conflict that took place regarding the funeral solemnities at the burial of his Protestant step-mother (1841). The royal warning addressed to the bishops on Dec. 2, 1841, was followed by many edicts which clashed with the rights of the Church, and led to a conflict between the Government and the spiritual authorities. Even the Chambers took part in the measures concerning ecclesiastical affairs. The command given to the military to genuflect before the Blessed Sacrament called forth violent demonstrations of displeasure, and the order was rescinded by the Government. Also the so-called five grievances of the Prince Wrede were supported by a majority of the Chamber. Yet they did not succeed in removing the ministry. This was left to Lola Montez, the celebrated dancer. Abel and the other ministers, after the memorandum of Feb. 11, 1847, received their dismissal. The king, enchanted by the "new Circe," also dismissed other able professors, Lassaulx, Moy, Höfler, Phillips, Döllinger, and joined the Liberals, who then led the unhappy monarch to the most perverse measures against the "Ultramontanes."

Digitized by Google

Under the ministry of Maurer, Zu-Rhein was appointed Minister of Worship, and he issued a great number of unjust and spiteful edicts against the Church. Oettingen-Wallerstein, minister a second time from Dec. 1, 1847, was somewhat more moderate; but Beisler was the more regardless of justice and propriety towards the "sovereign Church," because he had given his favor to the adherents of the apostate Ronge. In the midst of these contentions, Louis I. suddenly resigned his crown, March 20, 1848. He died in 1868.

§ 219. *Ecclesiastical Affairs in Prussia.* — *Troubles in Cologne.*

The bull "De salute animarum," which had arisen in consequence of the conferences between Niebuhr and Consalvi, and had been sanctioned by King Frederic William III. as "a binding statute," re-established, it is true, a regular state of ecclesiastical affairs in Prussia, but could not free Catholics from the oppressions of the Government, which still adhered to the traditional Church policy of the Prussian House, and violated in more than one respect the autonomy of the Church and of her rights.

Notwithstanding the articles of agreement, the State arrogated to itself the nomination of bishops, of canons, nay, even of the pastors; it infringed upon the right of the bishops to educate their clergy, controlled their correspondence with the Pope, subjected their pastoral letters and other rescripts to the supervision and approval of Protestant officials, while obstacles were everywhere laid in the way of ecclesiastical superiors.

How partial and unequal the conduct of the Government was, appeared in the assignment of Catholic churches to Protestants, in the establishment of Protestant parishes, and in the erection of Protestant schools, paid from the funds of the public treasury, although surely there was no need at all for this; whereas the petitions of the Catholics to be allowed to take up collections for similar purposes fell on deaf ears, although the necessity for so doing had been clearly proved.

Likewise the Catholics were, as if from principle or of set purpose, excluded from all the higher civil and military offices. The professors' chairs at the universities were almost exclusively filled with Protestants, and to them was intrusted the direction not only of the classes of the higher learning but also of the common schools. This one-sidedness of the Prussian State also manifested itself

Digitized by Google

in its dealings with the Catholic press, in the hostile attitude it assumed towards Catholic newspapers and magazines, and in the lawsuits brought against Catholic clergymen for assumed attempts at proselyting; while, on the other hand, Protestants might, without being molested or reprehended, revile the Catholic Church by word or by writing, and in the efforts made to proselytize they actually received the aid of the Government.

This was further obvious in the regulations for the ecclesiastical accommodations of the soldiery, who were all placed under the jurisdiction of a Protestant chaplain, no Catholic priest being appointed to any regiment. Further, it was clear from the royal or ministerial order of Aug. 17, 1825, respecting the education of the children of mixed marriages, by which the royal order of Nov. 21, 1803, which had hitherto been in force only for the eastern provinces of the monarchy, was extended to the western provinces of the Rhine and of Westphalia. This order was, "that children born in marriage should always be instructed in the religion of the father, and that no previous compact should be entered into between the married pair to annul this law; and only in the case of both parents agreeing concerning the education of their children, would nobody have the right to interfere." But herein was the stumbling-block: that the Catholic pastors refused to bless mixed marriages without the express guarantee being given for the Catholic education of the children according to the law of the Church. The opposition thus excited was so energetic that neither threats nor imprisonment availed to break it. The principal persons engaged in this contest, which was of so much importance in awakening conscience among Catholics, were Clement Augustus von Droste-Vischering, Archbishop of Cologne (1837), and Martin von Dunin, Archbishop of Posen and Gnesen (1838), who preferred the prison to unfaithfulness towards the Church, but who finally triumphed over her enemies.

Among the favorable consequences of the Troubles of Cologne may be counted the two ordinances of King Frederic William IV., by which (Jan. 1, 1841) the bishops were permitted to hold free intercourse with the Holy See; and on February 12 they obtained a department in the ministerial cabinet, that they might themselves take a part in regulating ecclesiastical affairs as regards Catholics.

In reply to the German bishops who had laid the subject of mixed marriages before the Holy See, Paul VIII. issued a brief of March 25, 1830, in which, while conceding somewhat to these mixed marriages for the avoidance of a

Digitized by Google

greater evil, he requires that the Catholic brides and mothers should be urgently admonished to provide for the Catholic education of the children.

Count Ferdinand von Spiegel, Archbishop of Cologne (+ Aug. 2, 1835), after a long resistance was prevailed upon by the Government secretly to conclude a convention with the Chevalier Bunsen, in which it was falsely stated that the order of Aug. 17, 1825, did not contravene the tenor of the Pope's brief. He signed this without including the Pope's assent as a condition. The archbishop then won over his suffragans to accept the agreement or convention which he had thus concluded; and instructions were issued accordingly to the general vicariates, the priests belonging to which had to conform to the instructions received. Then the papal brief was published.

His successor, Clement Augustus, discovered that the two documents were at variance with the brief; and not wishing to have to retract his errors on his death-bed, as had been the case with Joseph von Hommer, Bishop of Treves, he at once showed his determination to observe the terms of the brief. Thus the contest opened. The steadfast, undaunted bishop was, by order of the king, Nov. 20, 1837, carried away as a prisoner to the fortress of Minden, under the pretext, as alleged by the ministerial decree, that he was connected with two revolutionary parties. This act of violence created great excitement. Gregory XVI., undaunted, and anticipating the intention of the Chevalier Bunsen to deceive him, held, on Dec. 10, 1837, his celebrated allocution "Dum inter acerbissimos dolores," etc.

Under Frederic William IV. matters changed for the better. Clement August was acquitted of the charges against him by a royal declaration; and after some negotiations between the Prussian Government and the Apostolic See, he received, on March 4, 1842, a coadjutor in the person of the manly and prudent bishop of Spire, John von Geissel, with the right of succession. The new coadjutor now assumed the government of the archdiocese of Cologne. Clement August, who had refused the dignity of cardinal, died at Munster, Oct. 19, 1845.

The conflict also broke out at last in the eastern provinces. Martin Dunin, Archbishop of Gnesen and Posen, after he had long vainly endeavored to come to an agreement with the Government, finding himself compelled to choose between the commands of the king and the instructions of the Pope, published, on Feb. 17, 1838, a stringent pastoral letter. His clergy and all the bishops (excepting Leopold von Sedlnitzky, Prince-bishop of Breslau, who died in 1871, in Berlin, as an apostate) made common cause with the archbishop; he was declared deposed at the Court of Posen on Feb. 23, 1839. Dunin was summoned to Berlin, where he was commanded by the king to remain as a prisoner for six months; but this order he disobeyed, and returned to his diocese: on this he was arraigned and confined in the fortress of Colberg. The cathedral chapter then ordered the archdiocese to be put into ecclesiastical mourning; and this lasted until the steadfast pastor was restored to his flock, which happened in the reign of King Frederic William IV., on June 29, 1840.

Digitized by Google

Thus both archbishops, to whom thirteen American bishops, assembled in provincial council at Baltimore, sent an expression of their condolence and veneration,[1] came out triumphant from the conflict.

§ 220. *The Ecclesiastical Provinces of the Upper Rhine.*

At the urgent proposal of Austria the delegates of several German States[2] met together at Frankfort on the Main, on March 24, 1818, to determine the basis on which to draw up an agreement between the Government and the Apostolic See, according to the resolutions of the imperial recess of Feb. 25, 1803. The result of this conference was the Febronian-Josephinian "Outlines," which were arranged in two documents. The "Organic Statute" was kept concealed; but the other document was, on March 23, 1819, laid before Pius VII., by an embassy, as a "Declaration" for his acceptance. On Aug. 10, 1819, Consalvi, the Cardinal Secretary of State, presented to the ambassadors the "Esposizione dei sentimenti," etc., in which the Declaration was subjected to a severe criticism, the points that had been omitted in that document were emphasized, and the necessary alterations were demanded. The envoys answered, on September 3, in an official document, in which, having modified the Declaration in some unessential points, they affirmed it to be the "Magna Charta libertatis Ecclesiae Catholicae Romanae." The Holy See rejected the Declaration anew, in a note of Consalvi's of September 25, in which the anti-ecclesiastical principles are thoroughly pointed out and convincingly refuted.

In order to provide in some measure for the religious needs of Catholics, the Pope expressed his readiness temporarily to circumscribe the diocese, and appoint bishops for them; but he again expressly rejected the principles of the Declaration, and demanded further negotiations regarding the points to which he had taken exceptions. The united courts accepted the temporary provisional arrangement, and the Frankfort Commission drew up three new documents (between March 20, 1820, and Jan. 21, 1821). The sketch of organization contained the necessary notices for the erection of

[1] Collect. Larens. iii. p. 74.

[2] Dr. *H. Brück*, The Ecclesiastical Province of the Upper Rhine from its Foundation to the Present Time. Mentz, 1868. *Longner*, Additions to the History of the Province of the Upper Rhine. Tüb. 1863. Besides Baden, Würtemberg, Great Hesse, Electorate of Hesse, Nassau, and both Hohenzollers, other States had joined the Union (Bund), but afterwards separated themselves from those connected with it.

Digitized by Google

dioceses; in the instrument for foundations and in the "Ecclesiastical Pragmatia" all the articles of the Declaration which had been rejected by Rome and the stipulations of the Organic Statute were inserted. The Governments presented to the Holy See only the first defective document; the other two were kept concealed; the candidates for bishoprics were secretly to pledge themselves to these. On August 21, Pius VII. issued the bull "Provida solersque," for the erection of episcopal sees; but by a note of Consalvi's of August 20, he again rejected the false principles of the Declaration. The united courts declared, on December 27, that they were prepared to negotiate with the Holy See concerning the points which were as yet undecided; but on Feb. 8, 1822, they concluded a treaty which expressly stipulated the obligation of all future bishops and canons to abide by the Ecclesiastical Pragmatia, after which they designated the candidates for the episcopal sees.

The Pope received due notice of all these transactions; he therefore rejected the designated candidates, and to the papal note of June 13, 1823, a copy of the Pragmatia was appended. The negotiations were hereupon broken off. Subsequent negotiations, brought about by the mediation of Prince Metternich, between Baden and the Apostolic See led to the so-called Ultimatum which, in September, 1826, was accepted by all the princes united. On April 11, 1827, Pope Leo XII. issued the bull "Ad Dominici gregis custodiam," giving directions regarding the candidates, the appointment of bishops and canons, the exercise of episcopal rights, etc.

In the mean time the Frankfort Commission had drawn up the so-called Thirty-nine Articles, which, after the appointments to the bishops' sees had been completed, was published as a State ordinance. It was but a new form of the Ecclesiastical Pragmatia, which had been officially given up by all the courts in unison in September, 1824. In fact it again set aside the present agreement with Rome, and excited great indignation. As early as April 7, Baron von Hornstein in the Chamber of Würtemberg demanded its abolition. Unfortunately, the episcopate proved weak. The aged archbishop Bernard Boll of Freiburg contented himself with a protest, while the other three bishops did not even do this. Fulda alone tendered effectual resistance. Pius VIII., in his brief "Perveneratˮ of June 30, rejected the Thirty-nine Articles, and censured the weakness of the bishops. Gregory XVI., in a brief to the bishops on Oct. 4, 1833, also protested solemnly against the said ordinance, and pre-

Digitized by Google

sented, by Cardinal Bernetti, Secretary of State, a note of protest to the united courts on the 5th of October.

How little the bureaucracy respected the rights of the Church is seen from the fact that the State disposed of the ecclesiastical benefices, assumed the direction of theological education, and granted such scant influence to the bishops in the appointment of professors of theology, that, notwithstanding the urgent remonstrances of Archbishop Boll to the grand duke and his ministers, men of doubtful character were placed in the professors' chairs; among these were Reichlinn-Meldegg (+ 1878), who afterwards apostatized, and Schreiber (+ 1873), who taught at Freiburg. On the other hand, men of truly ecclesiastical sentiments (as Mack and Riffel) were dismissed from the professorships; further, the freedom of episcopal election was infringed upon, and ordinances were issued regarding Church property, nay, even as to the celebration of divine service; the exercise of episcopal jurisdiction was restricted, and laws were laid down on matrimonial relationships, on mixed marriages, etc.

Matters were worse yet in Baden, where the bureaucratic administration placed every obstacle in the way of the free development of the Church, and assisted all the anti-ecclesiastical efforts. It protected the association conducted by the priest Dominic Kuenzer in Constance against Archbishop Demeter; permitted, in despite of the protest of the archbishops' clergy, the introduction of profane music by Singers' Societies in Catholic churches, and thus contributed not a little to the decline of discipline, which manifested itself in a fearful manner by the performance of German Masses, by asking for synods with lay representatives, by the stormy movement against celibacy, by the unworthy administration of the sacrament of penance, and by the sacrilegious treatment of the Holy Eucharist. The consequences of this false position of a godless bureaucratic administration showed themselves in the revolutionary year of 1848.

Although the bishops felt deeply and uttered many complaints of the condition of the Church, but few attempts at resistance were made by the ecclesiastical authorities, and these few were but weak; but so much the more decided was the part taken by the noble baron Henry of Andlaw in favor of the rights of the Church.

In Würtemberg, where a similar state of affairs prevailed to that in Baden, Bishop Keller of Rottenburg, on Nov. 13, 1841, brought forward a motion in the Second Chamber "regarding the means

Digitized by Google

of preserving the peace of the Church." The motion was, however, disregarded here; but in the Higher Chamber twenty-five votes against fourteen supported the bishop's proposition. Yet the subsequent negotiations between himself and the Government led to no result.

When the illustrious Peter Joseph Blum was raised to the episcopal see of Limburg, in 1842, the contest for the freedom of the Church began in Nassau; and in Hesse it was more energetically pursued by Bishop P. Leopold Kaiser after the scandal created by Ronge.

§ 221. *The Condition of Ecclesiastical Affairs in Austria under Francis II. and Ferdinand I.*

Under Leopold II. the Josephist State-Churchdom maintained the chief authority, notwithstanding that the emperor, moved by the bitter experience of his brother, revoked some of the unecclesiastical ordinances of the last reign. The degrading and unsanctifying state of tutelage to which the State power had reduced the Church continued during the reign of Francis II., and became more and more injurious; the pernicious effects of it showing themselves in the decline of discipline among the secular and regular order of clergy, in a growing contempt for the clerical state, and in a most lamentable stagnation in the field of religious science.

The emperor, it is true, on the representations of the bishops, issued two letters, written by his own hand, on April 2, 1802, in order to check the decline of discipline among the clergy; but he was so little acquainted with the true cause of the evil that he attempted to correct it by the very means which had produced it.

The first autograph letter enjoined that gymnasia, schools of philosophy, and diocesan seminaries should be established, to which, if required, a course of theology might be added; but, apart from the circumstance that the emperor prescribed these measures without the co-operation of the spiritual authority, these institutions could not flourish, because the Josephist programme of studies, besides the unspiritual and unecclesiastical text-books and the like, were retained, and the direction of the studies continued to be under the control of the State.

The second autograph letter which authorized religious to wear their habits and observe their rules, "in so far as they had not been modified by the imperial decrees," and which forbade all intercourse

Digitized by Google

with "foreign superiors," was scarcely adapted to restore discipline and order in the cloister.[1]

Under these circumstances it could be of little use that in 1804 the supervision of the public schools was intrusted to ecclesiastics as to State officials, and that in 1808 the bishops were granted a greater influence on the higher and lower institutions of learning; neither could the introduction of Rechberger's Canon Law in 1810, instead of Pehem's Manual, at the lectures on canonical rights, effect a change of principle, since the whole was based on the fundamental sophism of the validity of the imperial ordinances.

The theological institution erected in Vienna in 1815 by order of the Emperor Francis, through the priest James Frint, subsequently Bishop of Pölten (1827), was organized after the Josephist pattern, and the supervision of bishops withdrawn from it. Yet at a later date ecclesiastical principles gained prominence in this institution, which was called Frintaneum, at which professors and rectors of seminaries, etc., received their training and education.

Only a common, united, and energetic movement of the Austrian episcopate could have brought about a salutary crisis in this state of affairs; but the bishops of the imperial State, though personally men deserving of respect, were far from uniting to achieve this, either because from their former position as referees of the Government in spiritual matters they were too much accustomed to regard the Church as under the guardianship of the State, and therefore failed to recognize the magnitude of the evil, or because in their isolated state they dared not venture to take up the cudgels against the Josephist bureaucrats.

The friendly visit paid by the Emperor Francis in 1819 to Pius VII. was not followed, as it had been hoped, by any change in the existing laws. Meanwhile the eminent writings of Catholic celebrities had found circulation in Austria; and in Vienna prominent men, like Frederic Schlegel, Zachary Werner, and others, labored directly and indirectly against Josephism. The religious movements in other countries were not without influence for Austrian Catholics. The imperial court did not remain unaffected by these proceedings from without; it granted the bishops many rights hitherto withheld, such as the supervision of the theological lectures (1822) and the censorship of theological writings (1824). The disciplinary power of the ecclesiastical superiors was much enlarged,

[1] The uncatholic Canon Law of Rechberger was removed in 1833. The account of the German literature of the period may be found in the original German of *Brück.*

and in cases of matrimonial difficulties the faithful were permitted to have recourse to the Holy See.

The admission in 1816 of the Redemptorists into the Imperial States was of great advantage to the cultivation of the scientific and religious life; among them was Clement Maria Hofbauer, illustrious for his merits. The Jesuits also came in 1820 into the empire, where they, being supported by the aid of zealous priests and of newly founded religious sodalities, awakened the genuine ecclesiastical disposition in the clergy as well as the people, to the great displeasure of the Josephist bureaucratics and Liberals, who continually complained of the "ultramontanism" which was gaining ground on every side. The united efforts of well-disposed clergymen at length succeeded in bringing about wholesome changes in theological teaching and in the government of the Church. Yet the concluding of a concordat with the Apostolic See proved to be a matter of much difficulty; the emperor, deeply afflicted on this account, could only urgently recommend the execution of this wish to his successor, through Prince Metternich.

Under Ferdinand I. no essential change took place in ecclesiastical arrangements, although the emperor, like his father, was personally pious and well inclined towards the Church. Nevertheless, in consequence of several circumstances, particularly of the Conflicts of Cologne, religion received a new impetus in Austria. The Government also fulfilled many just demands of the Catholics, and the imperial ordinances of July 5, 1843, and of March 25, 1844, adjusted the contest concerning mixed marriages; but it was not till the year 1848 that a freer and more independent position of the Church within the Imperial States was rendered possible.

In Hungary the Josephist ordinances had not caused so much confusion as in other countries of the crown. Alexander Rudnay, Archbishop of Gran, with full consent of the emperor, convoked a national council, on Sept. 8, 1822, for the re-establishment of ecclesiastical discipline. The question of mixed marriages[1] occasioned no little controversy even here.

[1] *Roskovány*, De matrimoniis mixtis, ii. 427 sqq.

Digitized by Google

§ 222. *The Catholic Church in the States of the German Alliance since the Year* 1848.

During the first half of our century the weight of an intolerant and arbitrary bureaucracy pressed on the Catholic Church in Germany,[1] which, in spite of solemn guarantees, made almost every free and independent movement denoting life impossible. Some few individuals indeed reclaimed the rights withheld from the Church, but the majority both of the clergy and of the laity were sunk in lethargy. It was the Festival of the Reformation, 1817, which by its hateful assaults on the Catholic Church roused an opposition, which first manifested itself in calling forth learned replies[2] and in magazine articles, and then brought about a wholesome reaction, which was daily increasing, against the arbitrary conduct of the Protestant political church government.

The reawakening of the Catholic spirit, notwithstanding all the efforts used by the State to repress it, was especially shown and furthered by the Cologne Troubles (1837) on the occasion of the pilgrimage to Treves,[3] and in the scandal caused by Ronge,[4] which was purposely favored by the Governments, particularly by that of Prussia.

With the momentous year of 1848, the contest against the equally false and injurious system of State-churchdom was extended much further. Amid the storm of revolution, at the instigation of Lennig,[5] Dean at the Cathedral of Mentz, and at the invitation of the Archbishop of Cologne, John of Geissel, the German bishops assembled at Würzburg, from Oct. 22 to Nov. 16, 1848, in order to devise the means of reclaiming the people, who were seized with the mania of revolution, and of wringing from the princes of the nation the freedom and independence of the Catholic Church of Germany, which had been guaranteed to her on oath and which had been so long withheld.

After their return from Würzburg, the bishops, according to the

[1] The relation of the Church to each separate German State is closely and synoptically arranged in *Vering*, Manual of Catholic and Protestant Canon Law. A collection of the most important literature on the subject is given in *Roskovány* Monumenta, etc., tom. xi., xii. ; Rom. pontif., tom. viii. sqq.

[2] *Roskovány*, Rom. pontif. iv. 526 sqq.

[3] See § 237.

[4] Ibid.

[5] *Brück*, Adam Francis Lennig. Mentz, 1870.

Digitized by Google

principles they had there adopted in common, formulated, each one separately, their demands in special memorials to their respective governments; while the newly established religious societies (Pius Society) widely promoted the ecclesiastical dispositions in the circles of society, especially that of desiring the liberation of the Church from the disgraceful shackles laid upon her by the power of the State.

The special demands of the ecclesiastical superiors of their own rulers consisted of the fulfilment of the stipulations previously made between themselves and the Holy See; namely, the right of establishing and governing educational institutes, of directing religious instruction, of selecting the text-books of religion, together with the right of training, examining, and appointing clerical ministers, of forming religious associations, and of founding convents. They also required the independent administration of Church property, the right of holding Catholic schools, freedom of worship, the abolition of the "Placet," and of all other ordinances impeding the freedom of the Church.

This reclamation of rights, however, called forth no little opposition; the conflict it aroused between ecclesiastical authority and the power of the State was violent, and is hardly yet at an end.

The patent of the Emperor Francis Joseph I., of March 4, 1849, guaranteed to Austria the freedom and independence of all the denominations acknowledged by the State. In 1850 the demands[1] of the bishops were partially complied with, through the imperial rescripts, and on Aug. 18, 1855, a concordat[2] was concluded with Rome, which was published by the emperor on November 5. In this document the false principles of Josephism were abandoned. The concordat, though by no means violating the rights of other denominations, nor conferring any extraordinary privilege on the Catholic Church, raised a powerful storm of opposition on the part of the Josephist States-churchmen, which was more particularly shown in the journalism of the unbelievers and Freemasons, who attacked it with relentless fury. Its enemies made it serve to stir up the most odious agitations against the Government and against the Catholic Church, and this before the bishops had carried out a single article of its provisos. The defeat of the imperial army in Italy in 1859, and the unhappy fate of Austria in 1866 in the war

[1] Many documents respecting these and the subsequent negotiations are printed in *Moy* and *Vering*, Archives for Catholic Canon Law.

[2] *Nussi*, Conventiones, p. 310 sqq.

Digitized by Google

against Prussia, were both pressed into action, and made an excuse for agitation against the offensive concordat. The dejected emperor yielded so far as to accept a liberal ministry; and this ministry sought, by oppressing the Church, to curry favor with that portion of the press which was in the hands of Jews and Freemasons, and to ingratiate themselves with what went by the name of "Public Opinion." The enemies of the Church were unceasing in their clamors against the concordat; and continued their agitation until, after several violations of it had taken place in spite of the protests and remonstrances of Pope, bishops,[1] and clergy, — violations by laws[2] on May 25, 1863, and violations by ministerial ordinances[3] in 1869, — this bone of contention, the concordat, was finally annulled by the Government on July 30, 1870, to the great grief of all good Catholics and amid the jubilation of the liberal and aristocratic enemies of the Church. On Jan. 21, 1874, the Government laid before the House of Deputies four plans of Church laws which had been framed according to the Prussian pattern, and by which again the evil spirit of Josephism was summoned to reappear.

The searching criticisms of the Austrian bishops, the encouraging encyclical of Pius IX. to them, and the letter penned by his own hand and sent by the Pope to Francis Joseph I. did not prevent the imperial sanction being given to these May-laws, which had already in a more stringent form passed the House of Deputies and the Upper House (of Lords). It was only the law regarding convents, which was intended to give a death-blow to religious life, that did not receive the sanction of the emperor. Even yet the leaders of the radical movement were not satisfied; they brought in a series of motions which were intended to cut asunder the last threads between Church and State.

In Hungary, where the episcopate had not been quite satisfied with the concessions made to the State in the Concordat of 1855, the conflict began after the year 1866. The laws of 1868, the reintroduction of the "Placet"[4] (1870) and other ordinances, called

[1] F. L. Rüdigier, Bishop of Linz (+ 1884), was condemned to imprisonment for his pastoral letter of Sept. 7, 1863; and other ecclesiastics who defended the rights of the Church shared the same fate.

[2] Archives for Catholic Canon Law, xx. 157 sqq. The laws referred to civil marriage, to the relation the Church bore to the school, and to the mutual relations of the citizens of all religious creeds to one another.

[3] Archives for Catholic Canon Law, xxii. 159.

[4] At the head of the defenders of Church rights in Hungary, stands the Prince-

Digitized by Google

forth an energetic protest of the bishops; while the Hungarian ministry looked kindly on the Liberals, without, however, being able to grant all their demands.[1]

The Prussian Constitution of Dec. 5, 1848, as also that of Jan. 31, 1850, guaranteed the freedom and independence of the Catholic Church;[2] there the bishops carried into effect the canonical precepts in the government of their dioceses, invited religious congregations and orders, etc., without being greatly impeded by the Government. Not that the Church was as yet in the full possession of all her rights, or freed from all oppression. With regard to school affairs, Von Ladenberg, the Minister of Worship, did not fulfil the just claims of Catholics, nor were they treated on equal terms in reference to civil rights. Still, on the whole, the affairs of the Church were tolerable up to the year 1870.

After the defeat of Napoleon III., however, Prince Bismarck hoped that through the aid of the so-called Liberals and of the "Old Catholics," he should be able to carry out the old Prussian Church polity; therefore, without having received any provocation on the part of the Catholics, he inaugurated the contest against the Church which goes by the name of "Cultur-kampf;[3] that is, the war of culture, or the struggle for civilization and enlightenment.

Dr. Falk, son of a Protestant preacher, the Minister of Worship, was a special tool in Bismarck's hands. On July 8, 1871, the Catholic department in the Ministry of Worship was abolished. Then followed, by the unanimous vote of the liberal Protestants, who formed the majority of both houses, the changing of those constitutional paragraphs which were favorable to the Church and the enactment of the four so-called May-laws (1873), which in many respects violate the natural and well-won rights of the Catholic Church,[4] and, being contradictory to her divinely ordained constitution, strike at dogma and aim at schism.[5]

Primate Cardinal John Simor of Gran. His treatises are in *Roskovány*, Rom. pontifex, vii. 1128 sqq.

[1] Great dangers arise in Austria from panslavism, freemasonry, and the Jewish press.

[2] Art. 12–19. Art. 15 provides that the members of the Evangelical and of the Roman Catholic Church, as well as those of other religious societies, shall direct and administer their own affairs, independently; and shall remain in possession and enjoyment of all the institutions, foundations, and funds set apart for each of them separately for purposes of worship, education, and charity.

[3] For the German literature of the period and details of events, see *Brück's* History, p. 818 sqq. *Majunke*, History of the Culturkampf.

[4] See *Vering*, Archives, xxx. 123 sqq.

[5] In the law on disciplinary power it is decreed (§ 1): "Ecclesiastical disciplinary

Digitized by Google

The autograph letter written on Aug. 7, 1873, by Pius IX. to the Emperor William, was answered on September 3, by the latter bringing forward serious complaints against the bishops and Catholics, whom he charged with resisting the May-laws, and designated as rebels and enemies of the empire. The papal encyclical of November 21 refutes these charges, and enumerates the grievances of the Catholics caused by the Prussian Government. This gave but a new impulse to the Cultur-kampf.[1] On May 20 and 21, 1874, the May-laws were rendered more stringent. On April 22, 1875, the discontinuance of the obligatory payment made by the State to the Catholic Church was resolved on. On May 31 the suppression of religious orders and of associations similar to religious orders was enacted. The laws of June 20, 1875, and of June 7, 1876, encroach upon the administration and use of Church property. The school-law severs the school from the Church. The State even claims the direction of religious instruction. Heavy fines,[2] imprisonment, exile, and deposition were used to enforce the observance of these laws among the clergy. The severity of the laws themselves was in many places surpassed by the harshness with which they were executed. Even the administration of the sacraments to the sick, in those parishes which had been deprived of their pastors in consequence of their resistance to the May-laws, was punished. At the present time far more than one thousand parishes are thus orphaned. The faithful are without divine service, and without the ecclesiastical means of grace. In other places excommunicated men, who are called State pastors, are appointed by the Government. Such of the clergy as fall away to the sect of the "Old Catholics" remain in the enjoyment of their benefices. To the "Old Catholics" the joint use of the Catholic Church is granted. The bishops' houses, in which the young students aspiring to future priesthood lived in common, theological institutions of learning, and priests' seminaries are forcibly closed by order of the Government. Professors belonging to the "Old Catholics" are appointed to the Catholico-theological Faculty at Bonn.

But all these measures could not debase the Catholic Church in Germany into becoming a politico-national church; neither did the circular letter issued by Bismarck, May 14, 1872, in regard to the (then) future papal election have any practical consequence. On the contrary, the conflict gave to the clerics and laity alike a glorious

power can only be exercised by *German* ecclesiastical authority on the ministers of the Church." (§ 10.) "Appeal may be made to the State against any decision of ecclesiastical authority imposing disciplinary punishment." A royal court of judicature for ecclesiastical affairs is to be erected (§ 32 sqq.). Its decision excludes appeal (§ 35).

[1] See the history of this contest in the works of *Siegfried* and *Schulte*.

[2] The fines which were imposed on bishops and priests amounted to hundreds of thousands. Single bishops have been condemned to pay fifty thousand marks and more.

Digitized by Google

opportunity to attest their fidelity to the Church and their readiness to offer up sacrifices in her behalf.

Pius IX. died in 1878, and was succeeded by Leo XIII., who, like his predecessor, offered peace. The Prussian Government also, in view of the fruitless effects of its acts, showed signs of returning to a better disposition, without however giving up its false system. Falk received his dismissal: he was succeeded by Puttkamer. After some fruitless conferences between Bismarck and the nuncio Masella in Kissingen (1879), some negotiations took place in Vienna (1880), the principal object of which was to enact the so-called "duty of report," which means imposing on bishops the duty of making known to State authorities the names of candidates to the priesthood for their approval or prohibition. (Law of May 11, 1873, § 15.) Leo XIII. was not altogether averse to tolerate this law under certain conditions, as is shown by his letter to the Archbishop of Cologne of Feb. 24, 1880, in this expression: "Non hujus concordiae maturandae causa *passuros*, ut Borussico gubernio ante canonicam institutionem nomina exhibeantur sacerdotum illorum, quos Ordinarii Dioecesium ad gerendam animarum curam in partem suae sollicitudinis vocant." But the conduct of the Government was such that a peaceable understanding on this point was out of the question. A slight change for the better was effected by the law of July 14, 1880. Under Minister Gossler the vacant episcopal sees were filled, the law was abolished by which the State withheld the payment of the clergy; in 1883 the exiled Bishop of Limburg, and in 1884 that of Munster, returned to their sees. The diplomatic relations between Prussia and the Apostolic See, also, which had been broken off in 1872, were in 1882 renewed. As for the rest the Government adhered closely to the May-laws; and neither the correspondence between the Pope and the emperor, nor the interchange of notes between the Cardinal Secretary of State and Von Schlözer, the Prussian ambassador, nor the visit of the Crown Prince to the Vatican in 1883, effected any change in their Church policy. The laws of May 31, 1882, and of July 11, 1883, served, however, to provide for the most urgent needs of the souls of the faithful. Unhappily, the Government still denied to the students of the Collegium Germanicum and to the theologians trained at Innsbruck dispensation from being subjected to the official State examination. It also made difficulties respecting the abolition of the law of Expatriation. In the interest of Church and State the long cherished desire of reconciliation is commencing

Digitized by Google

to be realized in consequence of the good understanding at which the Holy See and the Prussian Government are finally arriving (1886).

The Bavarian bishops [1] assembled in Freising from Oct. 1 to Oct. 20, 1850, in their memorial to King Maximilian II., desired the abolition of such ordinances as were contrary to the concordat and one-sided of themselves. The royal reply to this on March 30 and April 8, 1852, contained but insignificant concessions; on which account the bishops saw fit, on May 15, 1853, to make new representations to the State authorities. The ministerial rescript of Oct. 9, 1854, granted some of their demands, but did not yield in the most important point, — that relating to the theological institutions of learning.[2] During the whole reign of Maximilian II. it was in vain for the Bavarian Episcopate to expect the recognition of the rights and independence of the Catholic Church. Under Louis II. (+1886) its position became no better. The Minister of Worship, M. Lutz, showed his disposition to the Catholic Church by the ordinance of Nov. 20, 1873, in which the concessions made in 1852 were recalled. The patriotic-Catholic majority in the Legislative Assembly (Landtag) have not yet succeeded in removing the obnoxious minister from office.

The bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of the Upper Rhine [3] had already presented their demands separately to their respective governments in 1848. But as these were not heeded, they, in March, 1851, addressed their first united memorial to the governments individually, desiring the rights which had been so long withheld. It was on March 1, 1853, that they first received an answer, which proved to be very unsatisfactory. The bishops then, on June 18 of the same year, sent them a second memorial, detailing the grounds on which they demanded their rights, and adding that in case these met with a refusal they would be compelled to proceed to action. Such was in fact the case, as the Government failed to do justice.

The conflict began in the Grand Duchy of Baden. The aged and venerable archbishop of Freiburg, Hermann von Vicari, who, in 1852,

[1] *Henner*, The Catholic Church in Bavaria. *Vering*, Archives, vol. viii.

[2] The Archbishop of Munich, Count Charles von Reisach (+ 1869 as cardinal), and Dr. Fr. Windischman, his vicar-general, drew upon themselves the displeasure of the court by their pertinacity in the Catholic cause.

[3] Respecting the literature and sources of these controversies, see *Brück*, Eccl. Provinces of Upper Rhine, pp. 294–521.

Digitized by Google

had already incurred the ill-will of the ministry, by refusing (albeit respectfully) to have a solemn mass of requiem said at the death of the Grand Duke Leopold, was steadfast in maintaining his episcopal rights, which steadfastness finally led to the arrest of the archbishop on May 22, 1854. His constancy was repeatedly commended by Pope Pius IX. The conflict also broke out in Limburg, causing much vexation to the Bishop Peter Joseph Blum, and it was in 1861 that it was finally adjusted by a provisory agreement. The Government of the Grand Duchy of Hesse had, in 1854, concluded a preliminary convention with William Emmanuel, Baron of Ketteler, Bishop of Mentz, by which the evils of a contest between Church and State were diverted from the country. Christopher Florentius Kött (+ 1874), Bishop of Fulda, was enabled the more easily to come to terms with the Government of the Electorate of Hesse, as he was already in the undisturbed possession and exercise of most of the rights reclaimed by the episcopal memorial. Würtemberg concluded with Rome itself a convention on April 8, 1857, which convention contains great concessions on the part of the Pope. Baden also concluded an agreement with Rome on June 28, 1859, and one which brings strongly to light the placable spirit that animates the Church.[1]

Nevertheless, the attacks on both conventions began in the Chambers of Carlsruhe and Stuttgart after the defeat of Austria in Italy (1859). The governments yielded; the treaties which had received the sanction of the word of the princes, solemnly given, were torn to pieces, and a new law concerning the Church was proposed to the States, and by them adopted. After this, the contest subsided in Würtemberg under Bishop Lipp (+ 1869) and under his successor, Charles von Hefele, while it broke out all the more vehemently in Baden. The Church law was followed by a series of school laws, the last of which series is the introduction of obligatory public schools. After the secession of Lamey, Jolly became president of the ministry in 1866. Under him the Government and the Liberal Chambers vied with each other in the persecution of the Church. The unjust interference of the Government in the election of a successor to Archbishop Hermann von Vicari (+ 1868) hindered the filling of this see of Freiburg. The laws on the public care of the poor, on the legal rights and the administration of the foundations, secularized the Catholic institutions. The law of April 2, 1872, forbids "religious" to hold missions or assist in the care of souls. The new Church-law of 1874 surpasses in severity the May-laws of Prussia. On Sept. 21, 1876, Jolly was dismissed. By the law of March 5, 1880, the State examination of candidates for the

[1] See *Nussi*, Conventiones, p. 321 sqq.

Digitized by Google

priesthood, which had been enacted in 1867 and reaffirmed in 1872, was set aside. On May 2, 1882, the archbishop's see was again filled. The hostilities which the Convention of Mentz-Darmstadt in 1854 met with in the two Chambers of the States in Darmstadt finally induced the Grand-ducal Government to bring forward a new law for the Church, which, however, was not accepted in the Upper Chamber. As, however, the opponents of the ministry used the convention as a weapon of agitation against the State government, the Bishop of Mentz gave it up on Sept. 20, 1866.

The "Culture-warfare" (Cultur-kampf) was also begun in the Grand Duchy of Hesse in 1872 under Hofmann's ministry; the first fruit of it was the School Law of 1874, by which the rights and property of Catholics are greatly interfered with, and religious schools more and more destroyed. On April 23, 1875, the five new Church-laws received the signature of the grand duke.[1] After the death of Bishop von Ketteler in 1877, the episcopal see of Mentz remained vacant until 1886, when Dr. Paul Haffner, with the consent of the government, was elected bishop. The annexation of Nassau and Electoral Hesse to Prussia also involved the dioceses of Limburg and Fulda in this baneful contest.

The ecclesiastical affairs of the remaining States of the German Alliance underwent no change from the revolutionary year 1848. In Mecklenburg and Holstein the Catholics are treated almost as Helots; those of Saxony have much to suffer from the Protestant intolerance of the Government, although the royal family is Catholic. Hanover, by the endowment of the bishopric of Osnabrück, made a pleasant exception; and yet both here and in Hildesheim the (Cultur-kampf) contest broke out in consequence of the annexation to Prussia in 1866.

After the termination of the French war (1870), the German Alliance, which had been already dissolved in 1866, was replaced by the German Empire. Prussian preponderance soon manifested itself in a manner hostile to the Church. The majority of the diet, led by the Imperial Chancellor Prince Bismarck, accepted the paragraph respecting the pulpit, called the "pulpit paragraph."[2] They decreed the expulsion of the Jesuits, and of the congregations that were affiliated to them, aided the Cultur-kampf by banishing the Catholic clergy, forced the candidates of theology and even priests to take military service, and enacted that civil marriage was henceforth obligatory. The conflict was also transplanted to the conquered provinces of Alsace and Lorraine.

[1] Very recently the Hessian Government has consented to enter into negotiations with the Holy See.

[2] This "pulpit paragraph" is in a bill brought in and passed, which gave the State authorities the right to watch over what is said in the pulpit.

Digitized by Google

The bishops of Germany repeatedly assembled together at the tomb of St. Boniface in Fulda, in order to take counsel together as to how to avert the threatened dangers to the Church. The well-founded representations and protests addressed to their respective governments were fruitless, although the ruin to morality and to social order caused by this conflict is undeniable, and is not even denied by the statesmen who promulgate the laws.

§ 223. *The Restoration. — France under the Bourbons. — Louis Philippe. — Emperor Napoleon III. — The Republic.*

After the fall of Napoleon the throne of France came again into the possession of the Bourbons, whose position was rendered very difficult by the numerous political and religious parties of the country. Louis XVIII. (1814–1824) proclaimed the Catholic religion to be the religion of the State, without prejudice, however, to the rights of those of another creed. He recognized some religious communities legally, and had the abbey of St. Denis rebuilt and endowed. In order to improve the financial condition of the clergy, the Chambers, on the motion of Chateaubriand, permitted the Church to accept presents and legacies of real estate, and the king contributed, in April, 1817, the sum of 3,900,000 francs to the same purpose. The dissensions which had been occasioned by the late concordat caused the court to send in the first place M. de Persigny and afterward Count Blacas to negotiate concerning a new concordat with the Holy See. This was happily completed on June 11, 1817; and the concordat was a renewal of the one formerly agreed upon between Leo X. and Francis I.

The opposition of the clergy to the charter gave way before the royal explanation that the oath referred merely to civic obligations. Those bishops, also, of the olden sees who had hitherto refused to resign their bishoprics now yielded to the demand of the Pope. Yet the carrying out of the concordat was wrecked by the opposition of the Chambers. It was not till the year 1822 that a provisional treaty was concluded between the king and the Pope. This treaty fixed the number of archbishops at fourteen, and of bishops at sixty-six.

Although Louis XVIII. manifested no very ardent zeal for the welfare of the Church, and though the revolutionary and unchristian ideas had many representatives and defenders in France, yet religious life continued to grow stronger and stronger. Numerous sodali-

Digitized by Google

ties labored for the spread of the faith, and the cherishing of a genuine Christian disposition. The instruction of youth was again committed to the charge of the Brothers of the Christian Schools and to the Ursulines. Prominent and illustrious learned men like Comte de Maistre (+ 1821), Bonald (+ 1840), Frayssinous (+ 1841), the renowned pulpit orator Boulogne (+ 1825), and others, composed brilliant apologies for the Church and her arrangements.

Charles X. (1824–1830) was animated with a very different spirit for the Church from that of his brother; but he met with far greater opposition from the so-called Liberals, whose object it was to upset the Bourbons. This had already been shown when the endeavor was made to pass the law on Sacrilege (1825), and still more at the proposed new law of the Press (1826), which was intended to restrain the revolutionary and anti-religious press. The enemies of the throne disseminated more eagerly than ever the writings of Voltaire and others. Montlosier excited a violent storm against the Jesuits, who conducted several small seminaries and colleges. The revolutionary excitement was daily on the increase. Louis Philippe of Orleans, the aged Lafayette, and others stirred up the fire. To satisfy the malcontents, among whom was Chateaubriand, the king dismissed the ministry of Villèle, and accepted that of Martignac, which was forced upon him. On June 16, 1828, the Jesuit schools were surrendered as an offering to the Opposition. But greater sacrifices yet were demanded; and these Charles X. absolutely refused to grant, on which account he, on August 8, dismissed the "Ministry of Concessions." In its place came Polignac, with what has been termed the "Impossible Ministry." Against this the Liberal party, supported by the revolutionary press, began a warfare which also found its way into the Chamber of Deputies. All attempts at reconciliation failed. The dissolution of the Chambers, on May 16, 1830, only strengthened the Opposition, of which the Orleanists were the leading spirits. The success of the French arms in Algiers from June 14 to July 6 had no effect in restoring the good understanding between the king and the Opposition. The Ordinances of July 26, 1830, brought the revolution to an outbreak. Charles was driven from the throne, and Louis Philippe of Orleans was called upon to fill it as "King of the French."

The July Revolution had an anti-ecclesiastical character, which showed itself in the very first years of the reign of the "citizen king." The Catholic religion was no longer designated as the religion of the State in the new charter, and the church of St. Genévieve was

Digitized by Google

again transformed into a Pantheon, as it had been under the Revolution. Under the Bourbons it had been again given back to the worship of God. Now the Government allowed the atrocities committed in the church of St. Germain l'Auxerrois (Feb. 14, 1831) and the pillage and destruction of the archbishop's palace by the populace to pass without notice. The first nominations to bishoprics did not obtain the consent of the Apostolic See, but by degrees the relation between the court and the Church assumed a more friendly character. The atheistic-communistic sect of the Saint-Simonians, which again rose to the surface in 1830, and the "French Catholic Church" established by the Abbé Châtel were of brief existence; yet these and other such appearances had no little influence in causing the Government to draw nearer to the Church.

As defenders of the Catholic religion against the oppressions of the Government and the attacks of modern unbelief, the Abbé de Lamennais, Gerbet, Lacordaire, and Count Montalembert came forward and founded the periodical called "L'Avenir" (The Future), October, 1830. The erring principles on which it rested, especially the recommendation of severing the Church from the State and the like, called forth vehement resistance, and caused the interference of Pope Gregory XVI. The editors submitted in 1832, and the periodical was discontinued. De Lamennais himself, whose errors were censured by the Pope, signed, after considerable resistance, the act of submission laid before him on Dec. 11, 1833; yet in 1834 he published his political and religious-radical work, "Paroles d'un Croyant" (Words of a Believer), by which he severed himself from the Church without ever again becoming reconciled to it (+ 1854).

Genuine ecclesiastical principles began to prevail more among the clergy; Gallican and Jansenist views found only few to defend them. The attempt on the part of the Government to restore Gallicanism to its pristine shape in the seminaries by the introduction of the French Canon Law by the General Proctor Dupin was frustrated by the firmness of the bishops, particularly by that of Cardinal Bonald, Archbishop of Lyons. A transient excitement was caused by the disputes concerning the place of the Succursal priests, or Desservants.

The contention respecting the freedom of instruction was carried on with great bitterness. The opposition to the monopoly of instruction assumed by the State, particularly that of the infidel University of Paris, under which all the schools were placed, arose from the Catholic laity. The episcopate now joined them. The

Digitized by Google

Law of Instruction laid before the Chambers in 1844 called forth a violent opposition from the Catholic side, especially from the bishops, who were by no means dismayed at the threats of the Minister of Worship, Martin. At the debate in the Chamber of the Peers, Montalembert distinguished himself by his brilliant eloquence, in spite of which the Peers, on May 24, passed the proposition of Government by eighty-five against fifty-one votes. On June 4 the Law of Instruction was brought before the Second Chamber. The reporter was the unreliable and Church-hating Thiers. In order to gain the favor of the Liberals, the Government caused five novitiates of the Jesuits to be closed; but these Liberals required the further suppression of all religious orders, against which, on May 2, 1845, Thiers pronounced his philippics. On June 12 Montalembert undertook their defence. The French bishops also took the part of the religious orders. The Government entered into negotiations with Rome for the removal of the Jesuits from France. The Pope did not accede to this desire; but on the other hand, the general of the order dissolved the colleges, the novitiates, etc., and commanded the members to live in France as secular clergymen.

The religious orders exercised a great influence on the ecclesiastical life in France, and even the Government acknowledged the beneficial effects of their labors. Learned and spiritual men from the clerical body, as also from the ranks of the laity, came forward as accomplished and skilful apologists for the Church, in refutation of the revolutionary and infidel press. The French episcopate especially distinguished itself by its religious fidelity and zeal towards the Apostolic See.

The throne of July was overturned by the Revolution of 1848; and Louis Napoleon, first as president of the republic, then after the *coup-d'état* of Dec. 2, 1852, as emperor, was placed at the head of France. Between him and the Church there existed at first a good understanding. The law of March 15, 1850, proclaimed freedom of instruction; another increased the incomes of the clergy from the State funds. The religious orders and confraternities rejoiced in special favor from the side of the Government. Bishops enjoyed a greater freedom in the governing of their dioceses, more especially in being able to convoke synods, etc. The foundation and endowment of new bishoprics and other ecclesiastical institutions gave a good impression of the benevolent intentions of the French Emperor towards the Church, although he did not cancel the Organic Articles of 1802 or other laws impeding the liberty of the Church.

Digitized by Google

After the attempt of Orsini to assassinate the emperor on Jan. 14, 1858, a change took place in ecclesiastical relations. The war against Austria in 1859, the conduct of the Parisian Cabinet when the Pope was robbed of some of his possessions by King Victor Emmanuel, the September Convention of 1864, as well as the resistance offered by the Government to the papal encyclical and the syllabus, the suppression of the St. Vincent's Societies, and the new nominations for bishoprics, sufficiently disclosed the alteration that had taken place in the emperor's mind, though the real motives that led to it are rather matters of supposition than such as may be given with any certainty.

When in 1867 the emperor sent a corps of military to the Pope to assist him against the Garibaldians, he was principally induced so to do by the disposition of the French people, which found expression in the Chambers. The position taken by the French Court in regard to the Council of the Vatican gave the Catholics just ground of complaint; and the bad example it gave in reference to morals tended to promote the prevailing frivolity and licentiousness. After the unfortunate war with Prussia in 1870, Napoleon III. (+ 1873) was hurled from his throne, and again the republic was proclaimed.[1] Since the year 1879 the hostile party of Freemasons have been endeavoring to carry out the plans of the Jacobins of 1790, such as the law concerning the higher instruction, enmity to Catholic universities, sending away the religious orders from the public schools and from the hospitals for the sick, closing the Jesuits' schools, lowering the salaries in the worship-budget, making attendance obligatory at school instruction, with suppression of religious instruction, the introduction of irreligious school-books, enlisting the clergy in the military ranks, renewal of divorce laws, and the like; these sufficiently attest the spirit that animates the rulers.[2]

[1] Thiers (+ 1877) was the first president after Louis Napoleon's fall; and in May, 1873, MacMahon became president of the republic. The domination of the Commune in Paris (1871), to which Archbishop Darboy and several secular and religious clergymen fell victims, was suppressed by an armed force. The recognition of the legitimate king, the Comte de Chambord, Henry V. (+ 1883), was frustrated by the equivocal conduct of the Orleanists. After MacMahon's resignation in 1879, Grevy became president. Gambetta (+ 1882), Ferry, Bert, and others were among the chief enemies of the Church.

[2] See *Vering's* Archives for Ecclesiastical Records, vols. xliv., xlvii., and xlix.

Digitized by Google

§ 224. *The Catholic Church in Spain and Portugal.*

The Gallican, Jansenist, and philosophical principles imported into Spain after the accession of the Bourbons of France to the throne of this kingdom, received an ever-widening circulation through the activity of the Freemasons.[1] Under Charles III. and still more under Charles IV., in whose name ruled Godoy, an unbelieving and immoral man who had won the favor of the queen, these ideas had already penetrated into the social, political, and religious life of the nation. Even a portion of the higher clergy, nay, the Inquisition itself, was not always free from these pernicious, these false principles. The Government sustained the efforts made, usurped the rights of the Church, and seized on its possessions; it banished those bishops who were faithful to their trust, and under the minister Urquijo (1798) it even entertained the project of taking into its own hands the supreme guidance of the Spanish Church.

After the enforced abdication of Charles IV. in Bayonne (1808), the Church in Spain suffered even greater oppressions under Joseph Bonaparte, who had been placed on the throne by his brother the Emperor Napoleon I. The measures taken by this vassal of France met with no sympathy in the land over which he came to rule. Discontent increased, as these measures proved to be inimical to the Church. Catholic Spaniards flew to arms in defence of their religion and their freedom; and after many heroic struggles, they, with the help of England, drove the French intruders from their soil in 1813, and in 1814 raised Ferdinand VII. to the throne of his ancestors.

On May 4 the king annulled the constitution introduced in 1812 by the liberal Cortes of Cadiz, and restored ecclesiastical institutions and the Inquisition to the state in which they were before Joseph Bonaparte interfered with them. On May 29, 1815, he permitted the Jesuits to settle in Spain; but wanting strength of character and true piety, he soon fell under the influence of self-seeking and unbelieving chamberlains, and then he violated anew the rights of the Church, and sought to re-establish the despotism of the olden time. The many discontents that now prevailed were made use of by the Liberals to further their revolutionary plans; and after many fruitless conspiracies, a new military revolution in 1820 brought back the Constitution of 1812,

[1] See *Brück*, The Secret Societies in Spain, etc. Mentz, 1881.

Digitized by Google

and replaced the ruling power in the hands of the Liberal-Free-masonic party.

The persecutions of the Church were now renewed. The Liberal Government, in unison with the majority of the Cortes, abolished the Inquisition, prescribed the oath to the constitution for the clergy, drove away the Jesuits, suppressed the cloisters, did away with the tithes, confiscated the property of the Church and squandered it in great haste, forbade that any money should be sent to Rome, and interdicted all intercourse with the Holy See; they commanded the bishops-elect, who had not yet been confirmed by the Pope, to rule their sees as "gobernadores" (governors), and in the "Arreglo del Clero" (Rule for the Clergy) renewed the French civil Constitution of 1790.

The refusal of the Apostolic See to receive the Jansenist and Gallican L. of Villanueva as ambassador occasioned the insulting dismissal of the papal nuncio Giustiniani, Archbishop of Tyre, on May 22, 1823. Those of the clergy who would not accept the constitution were punished with imprisonment, banishment, and death. Yet but few of them took the oath imposed on them. To these few, however, belonged Cardinal de Bourbon, Archbishop of Toledo (+ 1823), who always sided with the strongest party. The combat against the Church became more and more bitter.

In 1823 the marching in of a French army restored tranquillity. The vainglorious, swaggering Cortes sought refuge in flight. Ferdinand VII. revoked the decrees hostile to the Church which had been extorted from him. The displeasure which the court experienced on account of the filling up of the bishoprics of South America by the Pope was but slight and transient; it scarcely disturbed the good understanding between Rome and Madrid. Secular priests and religious were now all seeking to heal the wounds which the revolution had inflicted alike on the bodily and spiritual welfare of the kingdom.

The alteration made in the right line of succession by Ferdinand plunged Spain anew into confusion. The provinces of the Basques and of Aragon rose, after the death of the king in 1833, in favor of the rightful heir, Don Carlos (V.). The Conservatives were for him, while the royal widowed Queen Christina, with the help of the Liberals, wanted her three-year old daughter Isabella acknowledged as queen. A series of new sufferings now began for the Church, whose supreme head did not acknowledge Isabella during the civil war, and by whom the bishops nominated by her government were

Digitized by Google

not confirmed. At as early a date as 1834 a Junta was formed, consisting of prelates and the laity, to consult concerning the new ecclesiastical division of Spain and concerning the endowments of the clergy. In the year following began the storming of monasteries, which ended by the suppression of the orders of monks and knights, and of the greater part of the nuns' cloisters, with confiscation of their property by the minister Mendizabal. In 1837 the confiscation of Church property by the Cortes followed. These also undertook, by means of a Jansenistic-liberal clerical commission, to edit a new civil constitution for the clergy; but this, though proposed and accepted, was never carried into effect.

Pope Gregory XVI. in his first allocution (1836) protested against these oppressions of the Church. The Government then appeared to amend somewhat. Villalba was sent to Rome, in order to conclude an agreement with the Holy See. But soon after the September Revolution in 1840, a new Church persecution began under the "regent" Espartero of which the minister Alonzo was the moving spirit. On March 1, 1841, Gregory XVI. held his second allocution on the persecutions of the Church in Spain. The ministry declared it to be an outrageous attack on the highest authority in the nation, forbade its dissemination, and also forbade papal writings and papers from being taken by the people; it revenged itself by confiscating what there was left of Church property; and on Jan. 20, 1842, proposed to the Cortes the plan of a law, the object of which was the rending of Spain from the Apostolic See.

The Pope replied to the sketch of this plan in his Encyclical of Feb. 22. 1842, in which he depicts the mournful condition of the Church in Spain, points to the hostile endeavors of the Government to overthrow the Church, and calls on all Christendom to unite in prayer for the unfortunate kingdom of Spain. The suppression of the papal document in Spain only tended to spread it further. The clergy and the people manifested in this struggle great fidelity to the persecuted Church, the defence of which was undertaken by the priest James Balmes († 1848), by Donoso Cortes († 1851), by several periodicals and daily papers, and was carried on with courage and skill.

After the fall of Espartero (1843) the exiled bishops were recalled by Gonzales Bravo and Narvaes, Duke of Valencia, the sale of Church property was discontinued, and negotiations with Rome were entered into. The concordat drawn up on April 27, 1845, did not obtain the royal approbation. In the year 1848 Narvaes took

Digitized by Google

energetic measures to relieve the oppressed Pope. On March 16, 1851, an understanding was at length effected between Pope Pius IX. and Queen Isabella. The revolution of the Progressionists in 1854, which gave the rudder once more into the hands of Espartero, again nullified this understanding, and brought new persecutions on the Church. The Pope then protested in vain against new robberies of the Church and the suppression of the ecclesiastical institutions of learning. But in 1856 Narvaez was restored to the head of the Government, and with him the concordat came again into force. The Spoliations of 1854–1855 led to negotiations with Rome, — the fruit of which was the Convention of Aug. 25, 1859. The driving away of Queen Isabella in October, 1868, was followed by new oppressions of the Church.

When Isabella was driven away in 1868, the Church during the short reign of the Piedmontese Prince Amadeus, and during the republic under the president Serrano, was exposed to new persecutions, which did not altogether cease when Alphonsus XII., the son of Isabella, ascended the throne of Spain. Article 11 of the Constitution of 1876, which promised freedom of worship, was with much vigor but without result brought forward by the anti-Catholics against the Church. The representatives of the philosophy of Hegel and Kraus had no more success. In modern times the Socialist movement in Spain has attained great significance.

The latest history of the Catholic Church in Portugal offers much that is deplorable. The depression occasioned by the French occupation of the country was by no means removed by the return of the royal family from Brazil. The condition of the Church became much worse after the Revolution of 1820, which brought a Liberal constitution to the nation. The abrogation of this by the Infant Dom Miguel (May 27, 1823) and the restoration of order worked well indeed for the Church; but it was all the more persecuted after the death of King John VI. (1826). His eldest son, Dom Pedro, who meanwhile had accepted the imperial crown of Brazil, wished the Portuguese crown for his daughter Maria da Gloria, against whom Dom Miguel opposed his right to the throne. The Cortes proclaimed him king (1828) according to Portuguese hereditary right, and the clergy as well as the people did him homage. The Church was then restored to her possessions and her rights.

But in 1834 Dom Pedro, with the help of the English and French governments, drove his brother from his throne, and the work of

Digitized by Google

plundering and upsetting the Church recommenced. The bishops and prelates appointed by Dom Miguel were deposed, the papal nuncio was sent away, and all clerical patronage abolished. Liberal clergymen, who not infrequently belonged to the Freemasons, replaced those of Dom Miguel, who had been driven away. Monasteries were not allowed to receive novices. Their abolition soon followed, with confiscation of all their property. Even after the death of the Church robber in September, 1834, against whom Gregory XVI., on Sept. 30, 1833, and again on Aug. 1, 1834, had pronounced two allocutions, the oppression of the Church still continued. The queen Maria indeed desired reconciliation with the Apostolic See; but the negotiations of Monsignore Cappacini with the Court of Lisbon led to no result, though some few bishoprics were filled. In the year 1857 the Holy See concluded an agreement with Dom Pedro V. concerning the filling up of the Indian sees, while in the motherland the Church is groaning to this very hour under the yoke of the followers of Pombal. The great want of priests is sorely felt. On July 3, 1862, Pius addressed an admonitory letter to the bishops. Even in modern times the Government has, by the promotion of Liberal clergymen, given ground of complaint to the Holy See; though even in this kingdom defenders of the Church in word and in writing are not wanting.

§ 225. *The Catholic Church in the Italian States.*

The concordat for the Italian Republic in 1803 was somewhat more favorable for the Church than that of France; but it was often violated by Napoleon. After the restoration, Victor Emmanuel, King of Sardinia, concluded an agreement with the Pope in 1817, in which a new division of dioceses was to take place. A new convention between Leo XII. and King Charles Felix (1828) arranged the circumstances respecting the property of the Church. After the death of the king the crown came to the collateral line, Carignan. Under Charles Albert the best understanding existed between Church and State, which was of most advantageous operation for the development of religious life. Unfortunately, this excellent king lent a ready ear to the voice of revolution, by the help of which he was to become king of "United Italy." Radetzky's victory near Novera compelled him to abdicate.

His son Victor Emmanuel II. (+ 1878) joined the friends of "United Italy," and took up a hostile position towards the Church.

Digitized by Google

On Aug. 25, 1848, the Jesuits were banished. On October 4 an anti-Church system of instruction was enacted. In 1850 the Privilegium fori, tithes, and Church Asylum were abolished. Archbishop Fransoni (+ 1862) of Turin had to suffer for his defence of Church rights by imprisonment and exile; and then the pillage and oppression of the Church began, while to the non-Catholics full liberty was accorded. The "Cloister Law" of 1855 ordered the suppression of those religious congregations which were not employed in giving instruction and in the care of the sick. The protest of the Holy See against these violations of right was disregarded. The soul of these hostilities to the Church was Count Cavour (+ 1861), who shrunk from no means which were likely to promote his object. His plans found support and approval in the secret societies, whose tool the king became. After the annexation of other Italian States to Piedmont in 1859, the oppressions and depredations of the Church were extended to them also, and still continue their action, while new ones have been added.

In the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, which at the Peace of Vienna had been transferred to Austria, a modified Josephian States-churchism prevailed, without the Government being absolutely hostile to the Church. Better times seemed to be in prospect in the year 1855; but the incorporation of Lombardy in 1859 and of Venice in 1866 with Piedmont, brought with it a severe persecution of the Church, the abolition of her religious institutions, and the confiscation of her possessions. The same thing happened in the Grand Duchy of Tuscany in 1859. The numerous benevolent institutions were spared as little there as in other parts of the new kingdom of Italy. By the Concordat of 1815, seventy-two monasteries had been restored, and the Agreement of 1851 had done away with the restrictions laid before that time upon the Church. Parma, Modena, Lucca, etc., fell a prey to "United Italy," whose dominion fell heavily on the Church.

Under the government of the French vassals, Joseph Bonaparte and Joachim Murat, the Church in Naples had been plundered and oppressed. After the return of Ferdinand I. from the island of Sicily, a concordat was agreed upon in 1818, which stipulated, among other things, that the cloisters should be restored, the inviolability of the possessions of the Church acknowledged, and the free intercourse of the bishops with the Holy See permitted. The revolt of the Carbonari (1820), who introduced the Spanish Constitution, was suppressed by the Austrians. The anti-ecclesiastical laws which

Digitized by Google

had been passed during the Revolution were again abolished. To Ferdinand I. (+ 1825) succeeded Francis I., and after his early death (+ 1830) the youthful Ferdinand II. ascended the throne. Like his predecessors, this powerful and energetic king was personally pious, and was a regent filled with good-will towards the Church; but he could neither prevail on himself to renounce his ecclesiastical pretensions on the island of Sicily nor to permit the Church to exercise an independent authority on the mainland. By extraordinary negotiations the Apostolic See at length succeeded in wringing from him a greater freedom for the clergy, and in inducing the abrogation of several oppressive laws. Yet, on the whole, State-churchism held the sway. So long as Ferdinand II. lived (+ 1859), the secret societies in Naples were not able to accomplish their plans against Church and State. They succeeded better under Francis II., whom treason and violence hurled from the throne in 1860, on which Victor Emmanuel was raised by the leaders of the Revolution.

The annexation of the States of the Church in 1859, 1860, and 1870, by the King of "United Italy," was also followed by the introduction of the revolutionary anti-ecclesiastical laws, the robbery of the Church, the spoliation of her institutions of learning with those for benevolent purposes.

§ 226. *Ecclesiastical Affairs in Switzerland.*

The establishment of the "indivisible Helvetic Republic" in 1798 destroyed corporate existence in Switzerland, and opened the way to the plundering and persecution of the Catholic Church. Napoleon I.'s Act of Mediation, 1803, which changed Switzerland into a Federative State, restored to the Church indeed the possessions of which she had been robbed, and guaranteed the standing of the religious corporations; but by throwing together, as if at haphazard, many heterogeneous elements, and by its method of deciding Church matters by the majority of votes, it gave rise to many religious contentions. At the restoration of 1815–1830 diocesan order was re-established. By the Convention of March 26, 1828, the new bishopric of Basle was founded. The difficulty respecting the abbey of St. Gall had been adjusted by Pius VII., July 8, 1823, by creating it a bishop's see, — Coire and St. Gall. Geneva was, by the brief "Inter multiplices" of Sept. 20, 1819, subjected to the diocese of Lausanne; no metropolitan bond of union existed; the papal

Digitized by Google

nuncio in Lucerne decided the more momentous matters one after the other. As a whole, tranquillity ruled in the land. The possessions and privileges of the Church were guaranteed by the covenants of the constitution. The religious character of the lower and higher institutes of learning was protected.

But as early as the year 1830 the adverse press opened a warfare against the Church by inundating the world with a regular flood of daily papers, pamphlets, calendars, and the like, in which they gave historical treatises (so-called) which teemed with calumnies and insults respecting the Pope, his nuncio, the clergy, Catholic teaching and ceremonial. In order to oppose this unworthy practice, some Catholic men in 1832 founded the paper called the "Ecclesiastical Journal of Switzerland;" while Professor Fischer, a nominal Catholic, edited the "Religious Gazette for Germany and Switzerland," in which he outdid the Radicals themselves in audacity and intemperate language towards the Church.

From calumny the next step was to action. In most of the cantons the bishops were hampered and hindered in the exercise of their office by the secular power. This was particularly the case in the diocese of Basle. A conference consisting of members of several cantons indorsed the Fourteen Articles of Baden, which subordinated the Church to the State. Pope Gregory XVI. condemned these on May 17, 1835; but there were cantons which still sought to enforce them.

The cloisters were a special stumbling-block for the Radicals, who were lying in wait to appropriate their possessions, while they calumniated and persecuted every clergyman who was faithful to his duty. On Jan. 21, 1841, the Government of Aargau suppressed all the convents of the canton. The universal dissatisfaction caused by this, together with the protestation of the nuncio and of the Austrian ambassador, occasioned the annulling of the decree by the Diet of March 15, 1841; but it was 1843 before the nuns who had been driven forth were able again to take possession of their cloisters.

At the urgent recommendation of the noble-minded councilman Joseph Leu of Ebersol, the Jesuits, who had established themselves in Freiburg in 1818 and in Schwyz in 1836, where in both places they possessed flourishing colleges, were, by a decree of Oct. 24, 1844, also invited to Lucerne. This excited the indignation of the Radicals, who organized a volunteer army for the overthrow of the "domination of the Jesuits" in Lucerne, and especially against

Digitized by Google

the councilman and Siegwart-Müller. After this attempt had failed they rid themselves of their opponent, Joseph Leu, by a hired assassin, and in November, 1847, with the help of the reformed cantons commenced a warfare against the Catholic Sonderbund (Separate Alliance), which ended by giving the victory to radicalism.

The oppression and spoliation of the Church which followed from this time formed but a prelude to greater sufferings. The Constitution of the Confederacy of Sept. 12, 1848, no longer guaranteed the possession and maintenance of the cloisters. The freedom of worship then proclaimed was not of avail to Catholics. The revised constitution of May 29, 1874, contains many articles which violate the rights and possessions of the Church.

Since 1848 the Protestant and mixed cantons have vied with each other in despoiling and persecuting the Catholic Church. In October, 1848, Marilley, Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, was imprisoned by the Radical Government of Freiburg, deposed and thereupon exiled. It was not till 1856 that he was enabled to return. Calvinistic Geneva has lately shown the hatred she bears to Catholics by driving away religious teaching communities (Feb. 3 and June 29, 1872); by the banishment of the apostolic vicar, Bishop Mermillod (Feb. 17, 1873), through the hands of the police; by a new law of worship (March 23, 1873); and by appointing an oath to be taken which involved a virtual apostasy, by which recusant priests lost their places, which were in that case given over to apostates.[1] In St. Gall the Radicals and Protestants fought against the faithful Catholics. The Law of the Confessions of Faith of June 16, 1855, worked destructively in the inmost existence of the Church. A change for the better took place in 1860; but since 1873 radicalism maintains the chief authority, which is very sensibly felt by Catholics. The excellent memorials of the bishop, Dr. Greith of St. Gall (+ 1882), have met with no attention from the Government. The see of Basle is the one most fiercely beset by the vexations of the Radicals.

State-churchism developed itself in a very haughty guise in Solothurn, Thurgau, and Aargau. On April 2, 1870, the so-called Diocesan Conference, consisting of the deputies from seven cantons, suppressed the Priests' Seminary of Solothurn, which had been established in the year 1858, and on November 19 forbade the priests

[1] Among them was the Abbé Loyson (the ex-Carmelite Père Hyacinthe), who had already married.

Digitized by Google

to teach the doctrine of infallibility. The master-stroke was dealt on Jan. 29, 1873. The Diocesan Conference had set a peremptory term of respite in November, 1872, after which the Bishop of Basle, E. Lachat (+ Nov. 1, 1886) was to answer for advocating papal infallibility and for excommunicating the "Old Catholic" priests Egli and Gschwind. As the bishop refused to comply with this demand, he was deposed on Jan. 29, 1873; and on April 17 he, the supreme ecclesiastical pastor, was exiled from Solothurn. On Dec. 23, 1874, the cathedral chapter was suppressed, and the liquidation of the property of the bishopric decreed. The governments of Zug and Lucerne protested against this infringement of rights. In Berne the Government drove away (1874) eighty-four Catholic parish priests in the Jura, because they would not break the oath of fidelity they had sworn to their bishop, and bestowed their church benefices on apostates, who in their conduct were notorious for bad morals. The Catholic parish-church of Berne was given up to the "Old Catholics." In order to sustain the schism, the Government in November, 1874, erected an "Old Catholic Faculty" in Berne. The Church-constitutional Law of Jan. 18, 1874, destroys positive Christianity. The Government of the canton of Zurich, in 1862, suppressed the ancient monastery of Rheinau, and in 1873 delivered over the parish church of the city to the "Old Catholics," the preachers of which sect traverse Switzerland in all directions, and are made use of by the Radicals for attacking the Church. In the wholly Catholic canton of Tessin, the Radical Government abolished, on June 22, 1859, the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Como and Milan, and made over the installation or deposition of the pastors of souls to the caprice of each separate congregation, while it placed Catholic worship under the supervision of the police. The Catholic institutions of learning were suppressed. In 1875 the elections of the great council brought with them the fall of the Government, and a better time awaited the Church, that has been so shamefully persecuted in this canton.

The pain occasioned by a persecution so wanton and so unrighteous is somewhat lightened when we contemplate the fidelity of the Catholic clergy and people, and the firmness displayed by the episcopate. The bishops of this country have repeatedly addressed well-founded memorials to the Federal Council; and the papal nuncio has often uttered his protest against their proceedings. The Holy Father encouraged the clergy and people in Switzerland by allocutions and briefs. In his Encyclical of Nov. 21, 1873, Pius IX.

Digitized by Google

condemned the proceedings of the Federal Council, on which this council in 1874 commanded the papal nuncio to leave. Thereupon all diplomatic relations between Switzerland and the Vatican ceased; but the solicitude of Pius IX. and of his successor, Leo XIII., in behalf of Catholic Switzerland was by no means lessened. Catholic Switzerland, which is constantly exposed to severe oppressions, as is proved by the Government of Geneva in the conduct they pursued towards Bishop Mermillod, by the efforts made by the Liberals to impose an irreligious school for the people on the cantons, — an effort frustrated as yet by the Swiss people, — is still an object of the Pontiff's care. The negotiations in reference to the see of Basle and the creation of a bishop's see for Tessin led to success. On the other hand, diplomatic relations with the Holy See, notwithstanding the steps taken by Leo XIII., have not yet been re-established.

§ 227. *The Condition of the Catholic Church in the Netherlands.*

The Constitution of the Batavian Republic had in 1798 proclaimed the equality of all confessions of faith; nevertheless the Catholics were continually exposed to the oppressions of the Calvinists, who closed all offices to them, did not give them back their churches, and by their School-law of April 3, 1806, deeply injured them in their rights. This condition of the Church was only transiently improved under King Louis Bonaparte; while the incorporation of Holland into the empire (1810) brought her new sufferings. The clergy were the first to feel the anger of Napoleon, whose demands they could not obey. With the accession of William I. of Orange to the throne of the United Netherlands (Holland and Belgium), the Calvinistic-Orange party came into power; and they sought to reduce the Catholics to the lot of helots, although they formed in fact two thirds of the population. Those bishops who refused to swear to the new constitution, which was hostile to the Church, were persecuted; the Organic Articles of 1801 were acknowledged as laws; and a church-council was established in Brussels, the director of which was the anti-Catholic minister Goubau. Van Maanen, the minister, who held like sentiments, vigorously supported him. In order to uncatholicize instruction for the young, the Government, on Sept. 25, 1816, established three universities, in which the offices were for the most part filled with Protestants. The most influential offices of the State were held by

Digitized by Google

the Protestant Dutchmen. The representations of the bishops (1817) were not heeded. The Bishop of Ghent, Maurice of Broglie, was arraigned before the seat of justice, sentenced to deportation; and his picture was hung between two thieves on the pillory. The candidates for holy orders had to take military service; the succursal parish priests were no longer paid from the State funds; and on March 8 and 11, 1818, the convents were prohibited from receiving novices. The priests who continued faithful were imprisoned or deposed, and on the few unfaithful priests honors and dignities accumulated.

The memorial of the exiled bishop of Ghent to the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle brought no relief to the Catholics. Even his death in 1821 did not alter matters. The "Catholic Society in Belgium," which, like the "Catholic Sodality for the Reading of Good Books in Holland," had for its object the dissemination of instructive and edifying books, was, on Aug. 23, 1823, suppressed by royal command; and on June 14, 1825, the abolition of the episcopal seminaries and the establishment of philosophical colleges was decreed. The Bishop of Namur and the administrators of the sees of the other dioceses protested against the new Josephist seminaries, and the clergy refused to take professors' chairs therein. In order to overcome their opposition, the Government, mainly influenced by Goubau, forbade any new pupils being received into the bishop's seminaries, gave the theologians the choice of entering the military service or of attending the philosophical colleges, and excluded from every office such of the inhabitants of the Netherlands as should complete their philosophical studies in foreign lands. On Oct. 1, 1825, all the little seminaries and other Catholic institutions of learning were closed by the police, and their possessions confiscated. This was followed, on Oct. 17, 1825, by the opening of the Philosophical College of Louvain, for which, with some trouble, a few professors had been found. The Catholic Belgians, however, held this institution in abhorrence, and clung all the more firmly to their faith, when they saw its defenders persecuted by the Government; while Freemasons and schismatics were favored.

The opposition of the States in Brussels brought the Government to reflection, and was the cause of its concluding in 1827 a convention with the Holy See, which, however, it had no intention of carrying out. The Catholics of Belgium did not receive any lightening of their burdens before the year 1829. The Government at

Digitized by Google

length handed the papal briefs confirming their appointment to the bishops-elect of Liege, Ghent, and Tournay, and the ordinances of 1825 were rendered null by those of October. Goubau and his like-minded secretary-general, Van Ghert, were dismissed. The bishops could now reopen their seminaries; and even those theologians who had pursued their studies in foreign lands were permitted entrance to them.

The September Revolution tore Belgium from Holland in 1830. The Constitution of 1831 guaranteed freedom of worship, freedom of instruction, and the right of association. The bishops now founded higher institutes of learning, with which the "Athenæums" of the city could not compete. The members of religious orders for the most part imparted instruction to the people. The chief spiritual pastors founded teachers' seminaries for the instruction of candidates in the teaching department, while the boarding-schools of the Jesuits busied themselves with the education of the children of the higher classes. On June 14, 1834, the bishops founded the free Catholic University of Louvain, whose first rector was the most worthy De Ram (+ 1865).

The most violent enemies of the Church in Belgium are the Liberals, who make common cause with the Freemasons and the so-called "Solidaires." Their ultimate object is the destruction of Christianity.

In order to effect the ruin of the faith and morals of the young students, they founded in 1834 the atheistic University at Brussels, results of which were shown in a horrible way in the Student-Congress at Liege in 1866. When Bishop Van Bommel of Liege in 1837 proclaimed excommunication against the Freemasons, the vile press assailed the Church with a flood of calumnies. That the Liberal enemies of the Church did not shrink from any means, however wicked, by which to attain their ends, is seen by the street mobs which were raised to provoke disorder against the Benevolent Law of 1857, and by the scandalous De Buck lawsuit in 1864. The court for the most part took a neutral standpoint in these conflicts; but it was to repel such attacks as these that both clergy and laymen undertook the defence of religion and morals most courageously in periodicals, in the chambers of Parliament, and in the daily press. The religious orders and sodalities developed a very remarkable activity, which was fraught with rich blessings. The Catholic Congress of Mechlin in 1863 was of vast significance for ecclesiastical life. In no other land in the world do Christianity

Digitized by Google

and atheism confront each other in so startling a contrast as in Belgium. The court remains neutral. The Protestant King Leopold I. was indifferent to all religion. His son Leopold II. is a sincere Catholic, yet he has shown but little firmness to the enemies of the Church.

With the ministry of Freemasonry, Frère Orban in 1878 inaugurated a time of the most shameful violation of the religious and political freedom of Belgian Catholics. In 1879 the irreligious State schools were decreed, and in 1880 all diplomatic relations with the Holy See were broken off in a very disgraceful manner. Then followed the diminution of State contributions to the cost of keeping up Divine service, the confiscation of the smaller ecclesiastical foundations, regulations against the admission of such foreign clergymen as are actively engaged in the care of souls, and lastly the attempt to bring the property of the monasteries under the control of the State. The king sanctioned these laws; the bishops, on the contrary, uttered a very energetic protest against them, and the Catholic part of the population espoused their side. The State schools, which swallowed up immense sums, remained empty, and the Catholic congregations founded "free" Catholic schools. Pope Leo XIII. remonstrated in favor of the oppressed Church. Very much to be regretted was the conduct of Bishop Dumont of Tournay, whom the Pope was obliged to depose on account of disorder of the brain, and who then arrayed himself against the Apostolic See, whereas he formerly had been a vehement opponent of the Liberals. The elections of 1884 brought a Catholic ministry to the government, the president of which is Malou; already it is seeking to do away with the Masonic school-laws, and to renew diplomatic relations with the Holy See.[1]

Under William I. the iron pressure of Calvinistic fanaticism weighed heavily on the Catholics of Holland. After his abdication the noble king William II. entered into negotiations with Rome for carrying out the concordat of 1827. His plan was frustrated by the opposition of the Calvinistic-Orange party. On the other hand, the king permitted the Dutch convents to receive novices, and allowed other orders to settle in the kingdom. He also contemplated suppressing the shameful school-law of 1806, but was deterred from doing so by the opposition made thereto by the enemies of the

[1] After the death of Cardinal Engelbert Sterckx (+ 1867), V. A. Isidore Dechamps, (+ 1883) became Archbishop of Mechlin and Cardinal in 1875.

Digitized by Google

Church. The projected re-establishment of the ecclesiastical hierarchy was fraught with so many difficulties that it was at first necessary to rest satisfied with calling the bishops "Vicars-apostolic in partibus."

The Constitution of 1848 proclaimed the liberty of faith, on which Pius IX. in 1853 re-established the Catholic hierarchy in Holland.[1] This raised the indignation of the fanatical zealots, but the storm passed over. The School-law of 1857 and 1863 banished religious instruction from the schools of the State. The Catholics are therefore thrown back on the foundation of private schools. In the Provincial Council at Herzogenbusch in 1865 the bishops admonished the faithful to provide for the Catholic education of the young, and in a pastoral letter indited in common on July 22, 1868, they insisted on the necessity of their attending to this duty. The members of the religious orders driven out from Germany in 1872 found an asylum in Holland.[2]

Bishop Laurent of Cherson (+ 1884) was appointed Apostolic Vicar for the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg in 1841; but in 1847 he was again expelled.

On August 17, 1870, Pius IX. raised Luxembourg to a bishop's see.

§ 228. *Persecutions of the Catholic Church in Poland and Russia.*

After the partition of Poland the Catholic Church of both rites was, in those provinces which fell to Russia, exposed to the most severe persecutions. Catherine II. had already, in spite of the most solemn promises, used the most disgraceful means to draw the united Ruthenians into schism, and to loosen the hold that kept the Latin Catholics bound to Rome. Under her immediate successors, Paul I. (+ 1801) and Alexander I. (+ 1825), the persecution was not carried on with the former violence, yet it was not altogether laid aside. The free intercourse of the bishops with the Holy See was still forbidden, and by a Ukas of Nov. 13, 1801, the "Romish-Catholic Commission" was erected at St. Petersburg as the highest court of appeal in ecclesiastical matters. Rome protested against it. The college has three civilian officers, — a proctor, a secretary, and a director of chancery, — in whose hands all the

[1] Utrecht became the archiepiscopal see, with the suffragan sees of Haarlem, Herzogenbusch, Breda, and Roermonde (Acta Pii IX., vol. i. p. 416 sqq.).

[2] The establishment of new diplomatic relations with the Vatican is announced to take place soon.

Digitized by Google

power centres; they are appointed by the emperor. In the year 1862 the proctor was a schismatic, the secretary a Protestant; neither did the chancellor-director belong to the Catholic Church. The president was the ambitious and intriguing Stanislaus Siestrzencewricz, Archbishop of Mohilev, to whom Alexander I. (1804) confided the supreme power over all his Catholic subjects.

Under Nicholas I. the persecution of the Catholic Church of both rites was carried on more systematically and in a more terrible form. The Government first directed its attention to the United Greek Ruthenians, whom it desired to wrest from Rome. In order to accomplish this object, the Czar disturbed the whole hierarchy of the Greek Ruthenians, interfered with the interior organization of the Basilian Order, suppressed the greater number of their monasteries, and after having abolished by main force the theological seminaries, commanded the whole of the clergy to pursue their studies in the Grecian-Russian Alexander-Newsky Seminary at St. Petersburg. The whole direction of ecclesiastical affairs lay in the hands of the "Greek United Commission," which at first formed a portion of the schismatic directing synod, and in 1839 was absorbed into it. The confiscation of Church property was intended to make the impoverished clergy still more dependent on the State. The bishops were forbidden intercourse with the Holy See, and no papal agent was admitted to the Russian court. In order to further the interests of the "Orthodox Church," the Czar established schismatic bishoprics and parishes in districts that had been wholly Catholic, and transferred Catholic churches to schismatics, while he oppressed Catholic bishoprics and parishes, and placed obstacles in the way of building and repairing Catholic churches and chapels. Great numbers of the cloisters of the Latin rite were suppressed. All worship in common between the "United" and the Latins was forbidden; and under heavy penalties the priests of the latter rite were prohibited in 1836 from giving the sacraments to "unknown persons," or from exercising their clerical functions outside of their own parishes. This was all done with the view of drawing the United Ruthenians into the schism. Desertion to the "Orthodox Church" was favored in every possible way, while the going over of a schismatic to "Latinism" was severely punished. Mixed marriages also served the Government in making proselytes. By cunning, deceit, and blows with the knout, whole congregations were driven into the schismatic churches. In 1833 the Government had thousands of Polish chil-

Digitized by Google

dren brought into the interior of Russia, there to receive a schismatic education. At length, on Feb. 12, 1839, three of the United bishops, with Joseph Siemasko at their head, went over to the schism, which, added to the means employed, of seduction and force, led the greater part of the clergy and people to take the same step. Those of the clergy who remained faithful were ill-treated and exiled to Siberia. To shut the mouths of the defenders of the Catholic Church, the Government forbade, under the heaviest penalties, that they should preach sermons composed by themselves, or any sermons that had not been subjected to the censure, — that they should give religious instruction, or in any way do aught to confirm the laity in their faith. It was not even permitted them to defend their religion by the pen, for a Ukas of 1844 took the printing-press from the Catholics. An earlier Ukas of 1842 had previously confiscated all ecclesiastical property "in order to relieve the clergy from the cares of administration which were incompatible with their office."

With regard to these continual acts of violence of a despotic Cesarian papacy, the Holy See could keep silence no longer. In 1832 Gregory XVI., who had, at the desire of the emperor, addressed in 1831 and 1832 two circular letters to the Polish bishops, to induce them to bring the Polish insurgents to obedience, as early as 1832 laid before the Cabinet of St. Peter the hardships to which the Catholics of Russia and of Poland were subjected, and implored their help. The Holy Father did the same in a letter written by his own hand to Nicholas I. (1834). He obtained only empty promises, while the persecutions of the Church went forward more grievously than ever. At length, in the allocutions of Nov. 22, 1839, and of July 22, 1842, the Church protested loudly and solemnly against the violent measures of the Russian Government, issuing a papal document of State in which their crimes were stated tranquilly and according to the manner in which they were committed. The statesmen of Russia and the directing synod did not even make the attempt of contradicting or refuting these accusations; they simply continued their disgraceful system of oppression.

When, in 1845, Nicholas I. came to Rome, the aged, gray-headed Pope made such forcible representations to him that the emperor declared himself ready to fulfil the just demands of the Church. At his command Count Bludoff negotiated with Cardinal Lambruschini and framed a concordat, which came to a conclusion under

Digitized by Google

Pius IX. in 1847.[1] But it remained a dead letter, each individual article of which was basely violated; and the persecutors of the Church still followed the same course as of old. Yet this same emperor, who himself trod every right of the Church under foot, declared war upon Turkey under the pretext "of protecting the rights of the Orthodox Church in the East."

During this war Nicholas was summoned before a higher Judge (1855). His son Alexander II. seemed at first to listen to the voice of justice, but soon adopted the plan of his father, to force on the Poles "the Orthodox religion instead of the Romish one;" and he followed the same course as his father with unbending severity. It was simply fear of the Parisian Congress (1856) that caused the Government to make some concessions to the Apostolic See, and to promise the fulfilment of the articles of the concordat. In November, 1856, this was published, though in a mutilated form, in the State Papers; but it never came to practical significance. The righteous petitions of the Polish Episcopate (1861) were not granted, neither did the representations of the Metropolitan of Mohilev and his suffragans find a hearing. The Polish revolt, stirred up by the Revolutionary Committee of Paris in 1863, made matters yet worse for the Church. Poland and Lithuania became places of most fearful desolation. The churches were desecrated by heartless soldiers, the priests were imprisoned or carried to other regions, and in many places the exercise of Catholic worship was rendered impossible. The slight hope that was awakened by the elevation of Felinski to the archbishopric of Warsaw soon vanished. The Russian Government was willing to receive a papal nuncio, but forbade free intercourse between him and the bishops. The newly established commission of worship and of public instruction for Poland was at variance with the constitution of the Church and the articles of the concordat, and the new archbishop of Warsaw was forcibly torn from his flock and afterwards formally deposed. The efforts of the Government became more and more visibly intent on Russianizing these lands, and making them schismatic. The Pope uttered complaints against these oppressions. The Government answered by the suppression of convents, and used various shameful means to tear the last united diocese of Chelm from Church unity, and oblige the Ruthenians to assist at the schismatical divine service, receive the Lord's Supper, etc. The representations of the Holy Father made no difference. The Russian

[1] *Nussi*, Conventiones, p. 273 sqq.

Digitized by Google

Consul even went so far as to insult the Pope in the Vatican, on Dec. 22, 1866, on which all diplomatic relations between the Holy See and Russia were broken off. A new States-paper gave an account of the conduct on both sides since the year 1845, in the form of a State document. On Aug. 8, 1867, the Ukas was issued, which cut off every connection of the Catholics with Rome; and somewhat later the suppression of the diocese of Podlachia followed. The spoliation and banishment of Catholic noblemen whose possessions were given over to the schismatics, and the command given to use the Russian language in the Divine service are to bring the work of perversion to completion.[1] In May, 1875, the united diocese of Chelm was abolished. A Ukas of 1872 had already suppressed the last Basilian cloister in Warsaw. Under Alexander III. in 1884 an understanding with the Holy See on certain points was aimed at, such as the appointment of bishops and the like; but the deliberations relative to the position of the United Ruthenians, etc., were postponed.

§ 229. *Catholicity in Ireland.*

In the year 1800 the Act of Union, which was consequent on the rebellion of 1798, annihilated the political independence of Ireland,[2] without bringing to the Catholics the equality in civil rights which had been proposed by the minister Pitt. Thus the iron weight of despotic caprice and of fanatical hatred pressed heavily on the necks of the Catholic Irish, after the conclusion of the Union; and the English Government sought by odious exceptional laws, such as the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, the Riot Act, etc., to hinder the success of any attempt made by the Irish to free themselves from the yoke.

Several bills were brought before Parliament to have these dis-

[1] See *Martinov*, Études réligieuses, phil., hist., et litt. par des pères de la Compagnie de Jésus, 1874, pp. 25 sqq., 544 sqq.

[2] Compare § 179, in which the literature is also given. *Charles Butler*, Historical Memoirs of the English, Irish, and Scottish Catholics, 2d ed. 4 vols. London, 1822. *Milner*, Supplementary Memoirs of English Catholics, London, 1820, in which the errors of Butler are corrected. *R. Murray*, Ireland and her Church. London, 1848. *Shea*, The Irish Church. London, 1852. *Lord O'Hagan*, Ireland in 1853. *Wyse*, History of the Catholic Association. 2 vols. London, 1829. Rev. *J. F. Bright*, English History. London, 1877. *Killen*, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland. *O'Connell*, Centennial Record. *Brück*, The Irish Veto. *W. J. O'Neil Daunt*, Eighty-five Years of Irish Hist., 1800–1885, 2 vols. *W. J. Amherst*, S. J., Hist. of Cath. Emancipation, 1771–1820.

Digitized by Google

qualifications of Catholics removed, but they were persistently thrown out. In 1812 Mr Canning, the prime minister, supported the Relief Bill brought in by Mr. Grattan. It passed the House of Commons by a vote of 255 to 106; but the House of Lords threw it out by 126 to 125 votes, — that is, by a majority of one. The representations of enlightened statesmen, who in the interest of public peace wished for the abolition of these unjust laws, failed to obtain a hearing either with George III. (+1820) or with the majority in Parliament. The "Irish Question" was only used by the leaders of the parties, for the sake of embarrassing the ministry then newly entered into office; the Whigs cared as little as the Tories for a real amelioration of the state of affairs. The proposal to grant emancipation at the cost of allowing the Government a voice in the election of bishops — that is, the power called the "Irish Veto" — met with the assent of the English Catholics, and was partially assented to by the Holy See, but it happily encountered effective resistance from Ireland. The Relief Bill of 1821 was rejected by the House of Lords, nor did the negotiations of some parliamentary deputies with the Irish bishops lead to any favorable result. It was the grand movement in Ireland under Daniel O'Connell, "the Liberator," that changed the aspect of affairs. Entirely devoted to the Church and to his fatherland, this genial and well-informed leader of his people, this man who attracted the admiration of the whole of Europe, had been for many years intent on restoring to Ireland her lost liberties, both religious and political. The rule that he laid down for himself and his followers throughout the whole of the noble course of his exertions was that the contest should be carried on in a legal way without the shedding of blood. The "Catholic Committees" founded by him held meetings in every part of the island, the purpose of which was to emancipate Catholics from their disabilities and to obtain the repeal of the Union. The outrages perpetrated by Orangemen, who from the year 1795 had formed lodges for the purpose of destroying the Catholic Church and Irish nationality, stimulated the zeal of the agitators to a higher degree.[1]

When in 1814 the Government suppressed the Catholic Committees, O'Connell, in unison with Shiel, founded in 1823 the "Catholic Association for Emancipation." This was dissolved by Act of Parliament in 1825, but was immediately replaced by the Association for

[1] The first "Orange Lodge" was founded in the village of Loughgall, county of Armagh, Sept. 21, 1795. For the history of this formidable association, of which the Canadian Orangemen are an offshoot, see *Chambers's* Encyclopædia.

Digitized by Google

Instruction. The whole of Catholic Ireland joined the band. In every province meetings were held to draw up petitions to Parliament. The law passed on March 9 forbade that meetings for drawing up petitions should last longer than fourteen days; accordingly the Catholics separated after every fourteen days to meet again some time after. O'Connell and Shiel encouraged and enlightened every mind, but the whole movement was kept strictly within the limits prescribed by law.

In the year 1826 Sir Francis Burdett introduced a Relief Bill into Parliament, which passed the House of Commons by a vote of 268 against 241; but it was thrown out in the House of Lords mainly through the efforts of the Duke of York, the heir presumptive to the throne, by a majority of 48 among 308 members. The noble-hearted Sir Francis Burdett renewed his motion in March, 1827, and again in May, 1828, but did not succeed in having it adopted.

The election of the "Liberator" as member of Parliament for Clare finally brought the matter to a crisis. Mr. Canning, the prime minister, who had been the advocate of the Catholic claims, died on Aug. 8, 1827; and as the Duke of Wellington, an enemy to the Catholic cause, was called to the premiership, agitation became still more lively. Monseigneur Patrick Curtis, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, addressed a spirited letter to the Duke of Wellington, who, like Mr. Peel (afterwards Sir Robert Peel), gradually found it necessary to favor emancipation. Both became convinced that the choice lay between conceding this act of justice and encountering a bloody civil war. Mr. Peel,[1] on March 23, 1829, introduced the bill in the House of Commons, where it was carried by a large majority. It was recommended to the Upper House on March 31, 1829, where it was eloquently advocated by the Duke of Wellington; it passed the House by a vote of 213 to 109 on the 10th of April. George IV. reluctantly signed the bill on April 13, 1829. After this, Catholics were eligible to all offices, civil, municipal, and military, save only the office of Regent, of Lord Chancellor, of Viceroy of Ireland, or of Royal Commissioner of the General Assembly of Scotland. A new oath was substituted for the old test oath.[2]

[1] Peel's splendid speech in Parliament and other accounts of the Catholic Emancipation in Ireland are to be found in the "Catholic of Mentz," vols. xxxii., xxxiii. See *Hansard*, Parliamentary Debates, vol. xx. p. 728.

[2] The first Catholic who at a later period filled the office of High Chancellor of

Digitized by Google

The Bill of Emancipation, it is true, put an end to the outrageous slavery of upwards of five millions of Catholics under four archbishops and twenty-two bishops in Ireland, but it by no means fulfilled all the demands they were justified in making. The Anglicans, who scarcely numbered one tenth of the population, were yet in possession of the Church property donated by Catholics for Catholic purposes; and all, even the clergy, were compelled to pay tithes in support of the Anglican service. The bitter grievance of paying in this way the Protestant preachers was after lengthened negotiations ended by the Tithe Bill of 1838. The offer of the Government in 1837 of granting an endowment to the bishops, on condition of having a right in episcopal elections, was unanimously declined.[1] Soon after the Tithe Bill was settled, the Repeal movement began by demanding, with its monster meetings, the repeal of the Union, or full justice to Ireland. The excitement reached its height in 1843. The efforts of O'Connell were energetically seconded by the Capuchin Father Matthew[2] (+ 1856), the founder of the Irish Temperance Societies. In order to suppress the exertions of the influential O'Connell, the Government had him brought before a Protestant jury on a charge of seditious conspiracy, and convicted; the sentence was, however, reversed by the House of Lords. The "Liberator" died on May 15, 1847.[3]

Among the bishops of this time, Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare (+ 1834), Thomas Kelly, Archbishop of Tuam (+ 1835), and his successor, John McHale, were prominent for learning and for the influence they exercised. The "Dublin Review" was founded in 1836, by O'Connell, Dr. Wiseman, and Mr. Quin. The "Irish Melodies" of Thomas Moore (+ 1852) greatly contributed to arouse the patriotic enthusiasm of the Irish people. The Union among the clergy was truly admirable.

The Legacy Bill of 1845 gave the Church the right to acquire property; and the Priests' Seminary of Maynooth, in conformity

Ireland was the late Lord O'Hagan, a man of great merit. See his "Occasional Papers and Addresses." London, 1884.

[1] By a decree of the Propaganda in 1829 the so-called "Domestic Nomination," first suggested by Father Hayes, was definitely introduced; by this, when a bishopric becomes vacant, the parish priests by vote nominate three candidates, whose names are sent to the Propaganda; one of them (as a rule) is selected and approved by the Pope.

[2] *Maguire*, Father Matthew. London, 1868. *M. F. Cusack*, Life of Father Matthew.

[3] *McCabe*, The Last Days of O'Connell. Dublin, 1847.

Digitized by Google

to it, received a moderate endowment from the Government. On May 9 a bill was introduced into Parliament for the establishment of three colleges in the north, west, and south of Ireland, in which, on similar principles to those on which the national schools are founded, pupils of all religions might receive a higher academic education. The measure was carried in both Houses. But the question arose among the Irish Catholics as to whether it would be proper for Catholic young men to attend such colleges; the question of the national schools had been decided in the negative by Rome, Oct. 18, 1848, at the instance of John McHale, Archbishop of Tuam. The bishops assembled at an important synod at Thurles in 1851 declared these latter colleges to be dangerous to the faith and morals of Catholic students. The same was done by the archbishops and bishops at Maynooth College, Aug. 19, 1869, under the presidency of Cardinal Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin[1] (+ 1878), when the whole system of mixed education was condemned. Nov. 3, 1854, the Catholic University,[2] established and supported by the contributions of Irish Catholics at home and abroad, was opened. In 1882 it was transformed into a philosophical faculty, under the name of Central University College.

Besides the College of Maynooth, the Missionary College of All Hallows, and the new Apostolic College of Limerick, there are a number of other ecclesiastical seminaries. According to the statistics of the "Catholic Almanac," 1885, there are in Ireland four archbishops, namely, of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam; in all twenty-four archbishops and bishops; 1,089 parishes, 1,004 parish-priests, 1,772 administrators, curates, and others, 446 regular clergy; or a total of 3,000 priests and 2,384 churches and chapels.

By an Act of Parliament (1869) the Established Church in Ireland was disestablished and disendowed; thus was a long-standing grievance to the Catholic people at length removed.[3]

Pursuant to the call of the Pope, the Irish bishops assembled at Rome in May, 1885, to consult with His Holiness regarding the holding of a National Council.

The see of Dublin, vacated by the death of Archbishop McCabe (+ 1885), has since been filled by Dr. Walsh, former president of

[1] *Moran*, History of the Catholic Archbishops of Dublin since the Reformation.

[2] *Molloy*, The Catholic University of Ireland.

[3] See the Catholic World, May, 1869. *Thébaud*, The Irish Race in Past and Present.

Digitized by Google

Maynooth College. Bishop Delany, of Cork, the oldest bishop in Ireland, departed this life toward the close of the year 1886.

The combined sentiment of Irish faith and Irish nationality, says Archbishop Walsh, is as vigorous and as active now as it has ever been at any period in the history of the past. The national movement[1] for what is styled "Home Rule," carried on in accordance with the admonition of Pope Leo XIII. to defend the "just cause of the country" by just means, is unanimously approved by the Irish bishops, who certainly have the welfare of their people at heart.

§ 230. *Revival of Catholicity in England and Scotland.—Restoration of the Hierarchy in both Countries.*

At the beginning of the present period the number of Catholics in England was very small. According to a report of the year 1767 they then amounted to only 69,376, and in 1804 this number had dwindled down to 60,000. In 1688 Pope Innocent XI. had divided England into four ecclesiastical districts, which about 1786 had 359 priests; the four vicars-apostolic had no permanent sees, and received their priests from the Catholic colleges of the Continent (Douay, St. Omer, Liège, Louvain, and Lamspringe near Hildesheim). This division lasted to the time of Gregory XVI., who on July 3, 1840, doubled the number of vicariates in the brief "Muneris apostolici;" the number of Catholics being at that time on a promising increase, and amounting already to about a million. This happy change was greatly owing to the able expositions and defence of the faith made by Catholic writers. Before this time the Catholics, being few in number, besides being politically debased and the objects of a host of prejudices, had lacked the means of making themselves and their religion an object of due consideration. From the time of the Reformation, the Catholic press had ceased to exist, or had been reduced to a state of captivity; the rise to significance in 1829

[1] See Catholic World, March, 1885, "Ireland's Argument;" also, April, 1885, "Ireland's Moderation." See "Ireland's Great Grievances, Land Tenure in Ireland and other Countries," in American Catholic Quarterly Review, 1881, vol. vii. p. 51. "The Situation in Ireland," p. 326. American Quarterly Review, "The Irish Land Bill," p. 508 sqq. See also vol. vi. p. 751 sqq. "The Parnell Movement. With Sketch of Irish Parties from 1843." By *T. P. O'Connor*, M. P.

Digitized by Google

was at once the signal and the cause of a better manifestation of Catholicity.

Before the time of Catholic emancipation, the works of Gother,[1] of Challoner,[2] Vicar Apostolic of London (1758–1781), Berington[3] (+ 1827), and Kirk (+ 1851), Baines (+ 1843), Fletcher,[4] Butler, Howard, Milner, Coombe, John McHale, and others, had tended to dissipate the current prejudices against Catholics that had been kept alive for centuries. A number of able writers,[5] some of whose names we shall take occasion to recall in these pages, continued from this time forth to defend Catholic doctrines, institutions, and rights.

The cause of true enlightenment was greatly furthered by periodical literature about this time. In this the "Catholic Magazine" and the "Tablet," the latter ably conducted for fifteen years by Frederic Lucas (+ 1855), took a distinguished part. The London Catholic Tract Society was earnest in promoting the recognition of what Catholicity truly is. The priests were indefatigably active under the direction of the vicars-apostolic, who held a synod in May, 1838, to lay down rules for their conduct. After the death of Dr. Poynter (+ 1827), his coadjutor, Dr. Bramston, a man of great piety and extraordinary learning, became vicar-apostolic of London, and was himself (+ 1836) succeeded by Thomas Griffiths.

The number of converts from the Anglicans, and even from the Methodists, increased from year to year. In the year 1838 a Catholic Institute was founded, in London, with three affiliated institutes

[1] Papists Misrepresented and Represented. It first appeared in 1685, and was through thirty editions.

[2] Memoirs of Missionary Priests, etc.; Edition of Holy Bible; Grounds of Catholic Doctrine; and other works.

[3] State and Behavior of English Catholics, etc. London, 1781. Faith of Catholics, by Rev. *Jos. Berington* and Rev. *J. Kirk* (1813), revised and enlarged by Rev. *J. Waterworth*, re-edited in 1884 by Monsignor *Capel.*

[4] Guide to the True Religion (1810); Comparative View of the Grounds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches; Difficulties of Protestantism.

[5] Among these are: The celebrated historian Rev. *J. Lingard* (born 1771, + 1851), author of Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church; History of England;—*Thomas Moore* (+ 1852), author of Irish Melodies, etc.; Memoirs of the Life of Captain Rock, Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion, London, 1833; — Miss *Agnew*, author of Geraldine, etc.; Sir *Kenelm H. Digby*, author of Mores Catholici; — *E. Lanigan*, who wrote History of Ireland to the Thirteenth Century; the Protestants *Macaulay*, *Dallas*, *Cobbett* (History of the Protestant Reformation), who in their historic researches earnestly endeavored to state the truth.

Digitized by Google

by the Earl of Shrewsbury[1] (+ 1852), who was a great benefactor to the Catholic cause. A society of ladies, under the direction of the Marchioness of Wellesley, undertook to provide aid for furnishing churches and chapels with the articles necessary for divine service; other associations arose for the establishment of religious free schools and for administering to the wants of the sick. Convents of nuns, established by religious who had been expelled from France at the time of the Revolution, had existed from the year 1794.

Many chapels had been built by emigrants; the cathedrals of London and York were also erected. In the year 1846 there were already ten theological institutions in England; among them stood prominently forward those of the Jesuits at Stonyhurst and St. Mary's near Birmingham. The suppression of the Catholic colleges of Douay and St. Omer furnished material for opening the colleges of St. Cuthbert in Ushaw, and of St. Edmund at Crook Hall, and of the Benedictines at Downside and at Ampleforth. The internal schisms among Protestants, the petrifaction of the Established Church, the study of Christian antiquity, and observation of the action of the Catholic Church in the various countries of the earth, by degrees led a greater number of Protestants to the full and complete recognition of the Truth.

In the Protestant University of Oxford a movement set in, which, though not so designed by its originators, led many persons to the Church of Rome. Several members of the colleges, who had observed with regret the laxity of the discipline prevalent among the more wealthy episcopal clergy, and had become aware of the increasing spread of rationalism, conceived the idea of inaugurating a reform of the High Church from within, by bringing it back, as they thought, to its apostolic-Catholic fundamental principles; in doing which they proposed to avoid both extremes, — that of the ultra-liberal Protestants and that of Romanism. With admirable diligence they applied themselves with this intent to the study of the ancient Fathers. They sought by prayer, by frequently receiving the Holy Eucharist, by good example, sermons, and writings, to improve the ecclesiastical spirit, and to revive the knowledge of many ancient Christian doctrines which had fallen into neglect or had not been sufficiently cherished. They adhered to that of the apostolic commission of the bishops and of the priests subordinated to them by an unbroken succession. It was John Keble who first gave the impetus to that far-spreading movement by his sermon on

[1] Memoir of the late Earl of Shrewsbury in the Catholic Directory of 1854.

Digitized by Google

"National Apostasy," delivered at Oxford July 14, 1833. This movement was afterwards called Tractarianism, from the "Tracts for the Times,"[1] composed in its exposition by John Henry Newman and his friends; these tracts numbered ninety in all up to the year 1841.

When the Rev. Dr. Edward B. Pusey joined the Tractarians and became the leader of the party, the name was changed to that of Puseyism. In many dogmas these men came quite near to the Catholic Church, as also in regard to ecclesiastical tradition, justification, the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the state of purification to be undergone in the next life, the veneration of saints, relics, and images; but they thought that these doctrines were disfigured in the Roman Church with many spurious offshoots, and that in the Anglican Communion the true Apostolic Church with true bishops and true sacraments existed. The idea of coalescing with the Eastern Church, as attempted by Mr. Palmer, soon proved to be a fallacy.[2]

Further inquiry led many to doubt whether Anglicanism were tenable; near as they came to Catholicity, they yet sought to escape it, as being branded with the mark of superstitious Romanism and papistry. But the logical consequences led directly to the result they wished to avoid, — namely, to Rome. Since 1838 many members have passed over to the Catholic Church. Pusey and Newman, the most influential among the Tractarians, sought to stem the tide. The latter endeavored in vain, in Tract Ninety, to demonstrate that the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Establishment could be reconciled with the teachings of the Council of Trent. This tract found many opponents. One after the other, the Anglican bishops declared against it. The Bishop of Oxford caused the "Tracts for the Times" to be discontinued. Newman himself, when he saw that the Anglican bishops condemned his well-meant effort, while at the same time they were entering into ecclesiastical communion with "heretical" Protestants by the establishment of the Anglo-Prussian Bishopric at Jerusalem, began to waver concerning his Anglican Church. In 1843 he gave up his parish duty, and after further inquiry became a Catholic in 1845. In 1847 he was ordained priest and joined the Oratorians, since which time he has labored with great success in defence of Catholicity.[3] His example was

[1] See Account of Tractarianism in *Newman's* Apologia, part iv.

[2] See the Catholic World, October, 1880, "The Changes in Oxford."

[3] See Characteristics of the Writings of John Henry Newman, by *W. S. Lilly*. New York, 1875. In 1850 he organized the Catholic University of Dublin, and was its rector for five years.

Digitized by Google

followed by Faber[1] (+ 1863) and many others, who became ornaments of the Church. Pusey, however, who in 1842 had publicly defended the ground taken by Dr. Newman in Tract Ninety, who had been for two years suspended from the University pulpit in consequence of a sermon he had preached on the Eucharist, who moreover was in many ways dissatisfied with the state of Anglicanism, could nevertheless not prevail upon himself to leave the Anglican Church. Many other ecclesiastics inclined to the Catholic Church, but were willing to wait for the time when the English Church should be Catholicized; therefore the Catholicizing ritualistic tendency, constantly assailed by progressive rationalism and looked upon disparagingly by most of the bishops, maintained its ground; yet after a while nine hundred Tractarians, many of whom were clergymen, entered the ancient church, which was continually on the increase by the accession of eminent persons to her ranks.[2]

In recognition of the promising success of Catholicity in England, Pope Pius IX., on Sept. 29, 1850, by the bull "Universalis ecclesiae,"[3] restored the Catholic hierarchy in England, with twelve bishoprics[4] under the Archbishop of Westminster. The latter dignity, together with the cardinalate, was conferred on Dr. Wiseman.

Dr. Wiseman was born in 1802 at Seville, of Irish Catholic parents; in 1818 he was a pupil of the English College at Rome, of which he afterwards became rector; in 1836 he, with Quin and O'Connell, began the publication of the "Dublin Review" for the furtherance of the Romeward movement; in 1840 he was appointed Coadjutor Vicar-Apostolic of the Midland District of England and, at the same time, president of St. Mary's College of Oscott. After the death of Thomas Griffiths (1847), he became acting vicar of London; he was a man of extensive learning,[5] and very earnest in his solicitude for the welfare of souls.

The act of the Pope respecting the hierarchy called forth the

[1] A great ascetic writer.

[2] An account of Puseyism and of the great converts of his time is given by *T. W. Allies*, in his interesting book "A Life's Decision." London, 1880. Mr. Allies, an eminent defender of the Apostolic See, became a Catholic Sept. 11, 1850.

[3] *Ullathorne*, History of Restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England. London, 1882.

[4] In 1879 the bishopric of Middleborough was added.

[5] Other distinguished writers of this period are: Spencer Northcote (The Roman Catacombs), Maguire (Rome and its Ruler), and Lady Georgiana Fullerton (+ 1885).

Digitized by Google

utmost wrath of Protestant fanatics; numberless speeches were made, pamphlets were distributed, and mobs organized with the magic cry of "No popery!"

In 1851 Parliament passed the Ecclesiastical Titles Assumption Bill, forbidding Catholics to assume or use the episcopal titles of cities in the United Kingdom; and the Class and Convent Bill, by which priests and religious were prohibited from appearing in public in the dress of their order, etc. Yet the storm subsided without serious consequences: the hierarchy, when once established, quietly continued to exist; twenty years later the bill was recalled. Cardinal Wiseman addressed, in 1851, a dignified "Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the People of England," etc., which made a great impression, and converts became more numerous than ever; thirty-three Anglican ministers came into the Church, among whom were Henry Edward Manning, Henry and Robert Wilberforce, brothers of Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford. In 1852 Cardinal Wiseman held the first provincial council[1] at Oscott, which was followed by two others in 1855 and 1859 (+ Feb. 15, 1865). He was succeeded by the able, zealous, and exemplary Henry Edward Manning,[2] who in 1875 was likewise created Cardinal. He was very energetic at the Vatican Council, and, like Dr. Newman, vigorously repelled the attacks made by Gladstone on the loyalty of the Catholics and on the Decrees of the Council.

The movement made by the Ritualists, headed by Dr. Pusey, in advocating the sacrament of penance and the monastic life, and in introducing the ecclesiastical ceremonies of the primitive Church, promoted the victorious progress of Catholic ideas. In 1869 the Royal Privy Council, and in 1873 Parliament in the Public Worship Regulation Act, proceeded against the Catholicizing Ritualists, and forbade all such practices as were similar to the Romish: but the prosecutions on this account only developed a more resolute firmness in the adherents to this party, and in 1875 many of them in a manifesto denounced the State bishops and their Erastianism. A disestablishment of the Anglican Church would perhaps occasion a new tide to set in towards Rome.[3] The foundation of the gratuitous Catholic University of London (1874), the composition of

[1] Decreta 4 Conciliorum Prov. 1852–1873. Edit. 2ª. Londini: Burns et Oates.

[2] See Characteristics of Cardinal Manning, by *W. S. Lilly*.

[3] Cf. "Ritualism and the Anglican Church" in the Catholic World, September, 1880. Dublin Review, October, 1885, pp. 406, 407. Catholic World, July, 1886, p. 473 sqq.

Digitized by Google

instructive and edifying writings, the increase in the number of the Catholic daily papers and periodicals, the establishment of seminaries, and the numerous additions to the monastic institutions furthered the progress of Catholicity.

The school question in England is in a very similar condition to that existing in the United States. The "Education Act" introduced by Mr. Foster in 1870, on the part of the Liberal government, created State schools on an exclusively secular system of education. Owing to their large public resources, they have a natural advantage over the schools voluntarily established by various religious bodies. Yet their establishment has aroused the energies of those who have the cause of religion at heart. The Catholic body in England, headed by that ardent promoter of religious instruction, Cardinal Manning, has established the "Voluntary School Association" for the purpose of promoting the cause of the Voluntary Catholic Schools, which are mainly dependent upon private zeal.[1]

In Scotland there were a few Catholics who, despite the hostile attitude taken by the Presbyterians,[2] remained faithful to the Catholic creed, and obtained their priests from the Scottish College of Rome. There were also Scottish colleges at Madrid, Paris, and Douay. Until the year 1828 Scotland had had two vicars-apostolic; since then it has had three. In 1829 there were but fifty-one Catholic churches there; but in 1848 they numbered eighty-seven, and in 1859 there were one hundred and eighty-three churches and chapels, besides an institution for the higher Catholic education in the College of St. Mary's at Blairs. At Edinburgh a great Catholic Association was founded. Public conferences were held to prevent Catholic doctrine and Catholic institutions from being presented in a false light; the "Catholic Review," the "Catholic Magazine," and the "Penny Orthodox Journal" were started for popular instruction. Immigration from Ireland has considerably increased the number of Catholics of late; they now number over four hundred thousand. In 1868 the three vicars-apostolic of the eastern, western, and northern districts received an apostolic delegate in the person of the Archbishop of Anazarba, Charles Eyre, who was placed over them by Pius IX., preparatory to the act of restoring

[1] By letters of the Propaganda of Aug. 6, 1867, and of Jan. 30, 1885, Catholic young men are forbidden to attend the national universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

[2] A vehement assault was made upon the Catholics in February, 1778, after the Parliament had placed the Catholics on an equal footing with other dissenters. At that time Dr. Gregory, a great friend of Bishop Challoner, was Vicar-Apostolic in Scotland.

Digitized by Google

the hierarchy to Scotland, which was completed by Leo XIII. in 1878. There are now in Scotland 325,324 Catholics, governed by two archbishops, four bishops, and 319 priests.

B. HISTORY OF THE INTERIOR CONDITION OF THE CHURCH.

I. CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

§ 231. *The Popes of the Nineteenth Century.*

After his return to the Eternal City, Pius VII., assisted by Consalvi, his Cardinal Secretary of State, was earnest in his endeavors to promote the temporal and spiritual welfare of his subjects, and to regulate the affairs of the Church in other States by entering into treaties with their respective governments.[1] The negotiations thus begun were concluded by Leo XII. (della Genga, 1823–1829). Under him the Cardinal Dean Della Somaglia filled the office of Secretary of State. The Pope issued stringent ordinances against indifferentism and against secret societies.[2] He bade the Italian bishops keep watch over the Protestant Bible-societies, regulated the educational system in the States of the Church, and proclaimed the Jubilee for the year 1825. The arts found a liberal patron in Leo XII., and he exercised great and successful energy in putting down the banditti. Under his pontificate the papal finances were in a good condition.[3]

Leo XII. was succeeded by Pius VIII. (Castiglione), who reigned but one year and eight months, and was in turn succeeded by Gregory XVI. (Capellari), a member of the Order of Camaldolites. During his pontificate the plots and intrigues of the secret societies began. Encouraged by the July Revolution, they raised the flag of rebellion in the Legations[4] and in the Province of Ancona. The troops of Austria restored a temporary peace; but the hidden fire yet glowed beneath the ashes. Foreign powers also interfered in the affairs of the Church, and presented the memo-

[1] See Literature, § 215. Cf. Cardinal *Wiseman's* Recollections of the Last Four Popes. *Roskovány*, Mon. Cath. ii. 1 sqq.

[2] The Freemasons have been repeatedly condemned by the Popes, and lately the condemnation was renewed in an Encyclical of Leo XIII.

[3] *Artaud*, Hist. du Pape Léon XII., Paris, 1843, et du Pape Pie VIII., Paris, 1844.

[4] The Legations were the divisions of the States of the Church.

Digitized by Google

randum of May 31, 1831. In the name of the Pope, Bernetti, the Cardinal Secretary of State, defended the rights of his sovereign. Gregory XVI. introduced judicial reforms, as well as reforms in the administration, in taxation, etc.; but the leaders of the Carbonari were not satisfied with this, and filled all Europe with their complaints and calumnies against the Holy See. The Pope, nothing daunted, proceeded with wondrous energy against the political conspirators, at whose head stood the notorious Mazzini (+1872). Peace was preserved up to the year 1843. Since that time, however, the revolutionary movement in Italy has gained new power, and the agitation against the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See has gained a wider extension, which has been furthered in no small degree by the conduct of the diplomatists.

As Prince of the Church, the learned Pope, who as Pope still continued to follow the strict rule of his order, developed a wondrous capacity and energy in defending the rights of the Church, which had been shamefully violated by several governments; in rejecting erroneous and dangerous doctrines as well as in supporting missions,[1] which received a new impulse and made great progress during his pontificate. Gregory XVI. expressly disapproved of the Polish insurrection.[2] The arts and sciences found in him a protector. Among the cardinals appointed by him were the two learned men, Angelo Mai (+1854) and Mezzofanti (+1849).[3] On the retirement of Bernetti (1836), Cardinal Lambruschino filled the position of Cardinal Secretary of State until the death of this great Pope on June 1, 1846.

Gregory XVI. held the revolutionary elements in restraint by severity.[4] His successor, Pius IX. (Mastai Feretti), sought to conciliate them by mildness.[5] He made Cardinal Gizzi Secretary of State, granted an amnesty to political criminals, introduced the wished-for reforms, and admitted persons of the laity to high offices of State. But the hopes cherished by the Pope were sadly disappointed, and the laudations which had been showered on him by the liberal and radical press were but too soon changed into rude and violent attacks. The followers of Mazzini, recalled by him from

[1] See §§ 219, 223, 224, 226.

[2] See § 228.

[3] Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti by Dr. *Russel*.

[4] Gregory XVI., on May 20, 1846, summoned J. Cretineau Joly to his presence, and commissioned him to write a "History of Secret Societies and their Results." *J. Creti neau Joly*. Paris, 1875.

[5] Acta Pii IX. 3 vols. Rom. 1854 sqq. See Maguire's Pius IX., new edition, by Rt. Rev. Monsignor *Patterson*. Pius IX. and his Times, by *P. Dwyer*.

Digitized by Google

exile, secretly pursued their intrigues, although they had hypocritically assured the Pope of their fidelity and gratitude to him.

The Revolution of 1848 found its echo in Rome. The concessions of the Pope, who, on March 10, 1848, gave a constitution to the country, did not satisfy the revolutionary party. They desired the Apostolic See to take part in the war with Austria. Pius IX. refused to do so. On this, the rebels compelled him to accept the revolutionary ministry of Mamiani. After his dismissal the energetic minister De Rossi strove to restore order, but on November 15 fell by the dagger of an assassin. The Pope, thus beset on all sides, left Rome (November 24), and found refuge in Gaeta. On Feb. 9, 1849, the Revolutionary Constituent Assembly proclaimed the Republic, at the head of which stood the triumvirate Mazzini, Saffi, and Armellini. Under their government Rome became the theatre of great public crimes. On July 3, a French army under General Oudinot delivered the Eternal City from the heroes of the Revolution, who took to flight; while the Austrians marched against the Legations.[1] The reign of the Pope was restored, to the great joy of the well-disposed. On April 12, 1850, Pius IX. returned to his capital. Cardinal Antonelli (+ 1876) became prime minister, under the title of Secretary of State. Before he returned to Rome, the Pope had already issued a proclamation declaring an amnesty, from the benefit of which only the greatest criminals were excluded.

While the Papal Government was occupied in promoting the material and spiritual interests of the people, the revolutionists continued systematically to calumniate and blacken it, at the same time that they took every kind of means to entrap the inexperienced youth of Italy into their secret societies.

The revolutionary party found an ally in King Victor Emmanuel of Sardinia, whose minister, Count Cavour, brought the "Italian Question"[2] before the Parisian Congress (1856). His accusations against the Papal Court had already been refuted by the French

[1] By two edicts, one of the 22d, the other of the 24th of November, 1850, the government of the Provinces and of the Commonalty was regulated. The law concerning the provinces divided the domain of the State into fourteen Legations, besides the capital city and the domain thereto belonging. The Legations are subdivided into Provinces or Delegations, these into Governments, and these again into Commonalties. At the head of each legation a cardinal, with the title "Legate of the Holy See," was to be placed, assisted by one out of the four fellow-members of the Constituent Council. Dr. *Fehr*, Univ. Hist. vol. ii. p. 909.

[2] *Roskoväny*, Rom. pontif. v. 418. Cf. The Independence of the Holy See, by Cardinal *Manning*.

Digitized by Google

ambassador Count Rayneval, in his report[1] of May 14, 1856; but this report was not attended to. England was on the side of the revolutionary party; and Napoleon III., intimidated by the bombs of Orsini, offered to lend a hand to drive Austria out of Italy (1859), the result of which was the loss of the Legations and of Romagna for the Pope. The battle of Castel Fidardo (October, 1860) despoiled him of the Marquisates and of Umbria, so as to leave him but a pitiful remnant of his former possessions. Napoleon had looked on tranquilly while the robbery was taking place. An attack upon Rome by the Garibaldians was repulsed by the papal army, assisted by a corps of French soldiers, in the battle of Mentana (Nov. 3, 1867). After the French had evacuated Rome in 1870, Victor Emmanuel ordered the city to be cannonaded. On the 20th of September of that year his troops entered Rome. Then followed the farce of popular election. Victor Emmanuel took possession of the papal palace of the Quirinal; the Pope, despoiled of his temporal possessions, remained in the Vatican, refusing to accept the law guaranteeing to him his freedom, and the civil list which provided him with a stipulated revenue.

During his long pontificate of thirty-two years Pius IX. in reference to Church affairs displayed a universal activity; he strove to reorganize the affairs of the Church in the several countries by making conventions with them; he reinstituted the Catholic hierarchy in England and Holland, and erected bishoprics and apostolic vicariates in the interests of missions throughout the world.[2] As supreme teacher of all nations, he encouraged learning; and by the support and countenance he gave, he enabled others to publish learned and valuable works on Christian Archæology and Art.[3] With the whole force of his authority, he resisted the degeneracy of the times, and frequently opposed and condemned the scientific, political, and social errors of the day. The renowned Syllabus, which was annexed to the Papal Encyclical of Dec. 8, 1864, was compiled from separate documents. Pius IX. assembled around his throne a great number of the prelates of the whole world five several times. The first occasion was in 1854, when the dogmatical defi-

[1] Copied in *Maguire's* Rome and its Ruler.

[2] He erected twenty-nine archbishoprics, a hundred and thirty-two bishoprics, thirty-three vicariates-apostolic, fifteen prefectures-apostolic, and three delegations-apostolic.

[3] *Rossi*, Roma sotteranea cristiana, etc., translated into English by Very Rev *J. Spencer Northcote.*

Digitized by Google

nition of the Immaculate Conception was proclaimed, on December 8; the second was at the canonization of the Japanese martyrs (June 9, 1862); the third at the celebration of the centenary of Sts. Peter and Paul (June 29, 1867); at the fourth time the bishops of the world were assembled to hold the Vatican Council (Dec. 8, 1869), when their labors were suddenly brought to a close by the invasion of the Piedmontese. The occasion of the fifth assembly was to celebrate the Jubilee of Pius IX. having been fifty years bishop (June 3, 1877).

In 1878, on Feb. 7, the far-famed pontificate of Pius IX. came to an end. His successor was Leo XIII. (Vincent Joachim Pecci). He, like his predecessor, is a prisoner in the Vatican; yet up to this time he has displayed an active energy which has encompassed the whole world; repeatedly and solemnly has he protested against the robbery of the States of the Church; most energetically and solemnly has he condemned the aspirations of socialism, while he has protected the sanctity of marriage and of property, and reformed philosophical studies. He has resumed relations with Germany, and through the mediation of Errington with England also. He has raised his voice against the oppression of Catholics in Belgium and Italy, and by his considerate conduct has prevented a rupture with France without detracting from the rights of the Church. He has made representations to Christian regents concerning their dignity and their duties, restored the hierarchy to Scotland, addressed loving and earnest words to Irish Catholics, recommended Catholic journalism, has directed his apostolic solicitude to the Christian East and to the Slavic nations as well as to the missions among the heathen. He has promoted science and piety, and endeavored to adjust the religio-political difficulties of Spain, and has condemned anew the secret societies. While Leo XIII. thus courageously advocates the cause of right and of justice, he enjoys the sympathies of the whole Catholic world; while, on the other hand, King Humbert in Italy does not for a moment feel himself secure upon his throne.

After the occupation of Rome the anti-ecclesiastical policy was introduced; the cloisters were suppressed, the Church was deprived of its property, and sectarians were allowed freedom of worship. Protestant churches and schools arose in Rome, and the Protestant propagandists employed every means in their power to gain adherents; thus far, however, money and persuasion have alike proved of no avail.

Digitized by Google

On the occasion of removing the corpse of Pius IX., on July 13, 1881, from St. Peter's to San Lorenzo, a vile rabble surrounded the bier, reviling his memory and desecrating his remains; of this outrage the Liberal Government took no notice whatever.

§ 232. *The Œcumenical Council of the Vatican.*

On June 29, 1868, Pius IX., by his bull "Aeterni Patris Unigenitus," convoked an œcumenical council to Rome,[1] the object of which was more precisely stated in said bull. The schismatic Orientalists and the Protestants received special letters from the Pope on this occasion; the former were, on the 8th of September, invited to attend the synod; the latter were, on the 13th of September, exhorted to unite themselves to the Church. The preparations for the council, especially the drawing up of the Schemata, or programme of proceedings, were intrusted to several commissions, to form which learned men of all nations had been summoned. On Dec. 8, 1869, the synod was solemnly opened in the Basilica of St. Peter. Seven hundred and forty-seven bishops of the Eastern and Western Churches were present. In the public sessions the Pope presided in person; in the general congregations five cardinals took the presidency. A papal bull of Nov. 27, 1869, had already determined the Order of Proceedings; but on the petition of the majority of the council it received, on Feb. 20, 1870, several additional resolutions, in order to bring the council to a more speedy termination. The first public session was devoted to the solemn opening of the council, and in the second (Jan. 6, 1870) the Fathers recited the Tridentine profession of faith. It was at the third session, on April 24, that the first dogmatic decree of faith was solemnly proclaimed and the opposing errors condemned. Thereupon the scheme ("schema") of the Church came before them; and at the request of the majority of the council, a beginning was made by the discussion on the Primacy.

The discussion was carried on with great animation. The minority of the bishops assembled in Rome were against the dogmatic definition of papal infallibility, while the far larger majority were

[1] Acta et decret. ss. Oecum. Conc. Vatic. 2 fasc. Frib., 1871. *Cecconi*, Hist. of Vatican Council. Cardinal *Manning*, Vatican Council and its Definitions; The True Story of the Vatican Council. *Fessler*, The Vatican Council, etc. A complete collection of all documents referring to the Vatican is contained in *Roskovány*, Rom. pontif. tom. vii. sqq. The Protestant Dr. *Emil Friedberg* composed a "Collection of Documents of the First Vatican Council;" it contains also a list of works on the Council.

Digitized by Google

most earnest in desiring it. The discussion was prolonged for some time, and it was not till the Fathers had maturely considered all the reasons for and against the declaration of the infallibility of the Pope in his office as teacher that in the fourth public session (July 18) the dogmatical definition of the Primacy and of the infallibility of the Pope in deciding matters of faith and morals was decided on, in the presence of five hundred and thirty-five bishops.

Very few of the prelates objected to the dogma in itself; the other members of the minority thought the declaration of the dogma inopportune, because, as they expressed it, there was no special reason for defining it, and it might serve as a handle for the enemies of the Church and even for governments to use to the injury of the Church. But outside the circle of the bishops the most odious agitation was carried on against the declaration of papal infallibility. This agitation had begun before the opening of the council, and was continued during the debates with ever-increasing bitterness. At the head of the anti-infallibilists stood Döllinger of Munich; he was joined by several professors of theology who believed that the freedom of German science would be endangered by the infallible doctrinal authority of the Pope. In order to influence public opinion, *ex parte* statements appeared in the public papers concerning the doings of the council; while the so-called "Janus" was written, with an appearance of learning, ostensibly to combat the dogma on historic and dogmatic grounds.[1] Diplomacy also took part in the agitation. The governments indeed rejected the proposition of Prince Hohenlohe to make common cause against the council, while they carried on their intrigues partly in secret, partly openly. The future will perhaps withdraw the veil which now covers the whole transaction, and enable us to form a correct judgment respecting the acts of the governments. The enemies of the Church were looking for the apostasy of several bishops, but happily their expectations were not fulfilled; all the Catholic bishops submitted to the decree of the council. Meantime the struggle is not ended yet. As in the days gone by the 'Ομοούσιος, so in our times the "Infallibile Magisterium" of the Pope becomes the subject of bitter polemics, the aim of which is, consciously or unconsciously, the denial of the infallible authority of the Church in teaching, involving the denial of the divine authority of the Church itself.

[1] *Janus*, The Pope and the Council. Leipzig, 1869. *Hergenröther* wrote an Anti-Janus, Freib. 1870, translated into English by *J. B. Robertson*. Dublin, 1870. In 1872 *Hergenröther* wrote also "The Catholic Church and Christian State."

Digitized by Google

Several courts made the dogmatic decision on this head a pretext for evading the fulfilment of the obligations they were under towards the Church, and for enacting the most stringent laws against her. Professor Von Schulte became the apologist of State power.

In France and Italy the decree found opponents; but here they did not gain ground. In some cantons of Switzerland, however, the opposition was carried on more successfully. After the so-called "Congress of the Old Catholics" of Munich, a new sect was formed, which was, sad to say, also joined by several men renowned for their knowledge and learning in Catholic literature.

After the inroads of the Piedmontese, the Pope adjourned the council, which will resume its salutary labors when the restoration of order and of the legitimate government affords the opportunity.

On religious orders and congregations, see § 239.

II. DEVELOPMENT OF DOCTRINE.

1. Scientific Studies.

§ 238. *Theological Science in the Nineteenth Century.*

The demolition of ecclesiastical order, more especially the suppression of the institutions of learning and of the scientific corporations of the Catholic Church throughout the whole Continent of Europe, which ensued from the French Revolution and from secularization, was of immeasurable damage to ecclesiastical science, which had already suffered greatly by the rationalism of the eighteenth century and by the Josephist enlightenment.

After the reorganization of this ecclesiastical order, the Church, robbed of her property, possessed neither an adequate number of able teachers nor means to build up new institutions for study; besides which the State power debarred her from exercising any effective influence on the higher schools, over which the State claimed exclusive direction, and in point of fact enforced its claim.

As if to increase the evil, deistic and pantheistic philosophy continued to spread, and exerted the most pernicious influence on science, which became divested more and more of its Christian character.

The transformation in Germany was the saddest of all. The old Catholic universities were either suppressed or changed into high-

Digitized by Google

schools conducted on the principles of so-called parity or equality, but in which Protestantism greatly predominated. The philosophy of a Kant, a Schelling, and a Hegel were presented by the professorial chairs, offering in a brilliant form the rationalistico-pantheistic views of German classics to the so-called educated public. By proceedings of this character the Catholic Church was muzzled; even the education of the clergy was conducted by the State. Yet in Germany, as in other countries,[1] the Catholic Church surmounted the many obstacles it had to encounter, and by degrees a Catholic science[2] arose, which returned more and more to the principles of the great Catholic philosophers and theologians, whose profound works have been frequently re-edited in our days.

With regard to the separate branches of science we will give only short intimations.

Dogmatics[3] were treated partly as positive, mostly in the form of a compendium with a short statement of proofs and refutation of objections; partly as speculative, in opposition to the anti-Christian speculations.

Many theologians strayed from the path of the true faith, either because they based their reasonings on the false principles of the philosophy in vogue, or because they themselves set up one-sided and erroneous systems, and thus came into collision with the truth.

The scientific aberrations and controversies of modern times refer principally to the relationships that philosophy and theology bear to each other, to those between the natural and the supernatural phenomena as well as those between liberty and grace.

The controversy concerning the speculative theology of George Hermes, Professor of Bonn (+ 1831), assumed a special significance. Hermes, starting from positive doubt, was desirous of constructing theology on the basis of philosophy,[4] and besides this fell into the

[1] On Great Britain, see §§ 229, 230.

[2] Thesaurus librorum rei cath. 3 vols. Würzburg, 1850.

[3] The modern dogmatic teachers are: Liebermann (+ 1844), Klee (+ 1840), Staudenmaier (+ 1856), Kuhn, Berlage, Dieringer (+ 1876), Friedhof, Oswald, Schwetz, Reinerding, Denzinger, Kleutgen, Schätzler, Heinrich, Scheeben, Glossner (of Germany), Dens, Laforet, Jungmann, Schouppe (of Belgium), Cardinal Gousset, Hilarius (of Paris), Martinet, Archbishop Kenrick (of Baltimore, + 1863), Archbishop Spalding (+ 1872); the Capuchin Albert (of Bulsano), Perrone (+ 1876), Passaglia, Schrader (+ 1875), Cardinal Franzelin, Cardinal Guidi, Hurter, Mazella, De Augustinis, the philosophers Liberatore, Tongiorgi, Palmieri, Sanseverino, Cardinal Zigliara, and others.

[4] "Rationem principem normam et unicum medium esse, quo homo assequi possit

Digitized by Google

error of rationalism respecting certain dogmas. In 1835 the Apostolic See after a careful examination condemned the false doctrine of some propositions; but some of his pupils refused to accept the papal brief on a plea of Jansenist distinction, that the condemned propositions were not to be found in the writings of this professor. The professors Elvenich in Breslau and Braun (+ 1863) in Bonn undertook to convince the Holy See of this, but were required to accept the papal brief unconditionally. Braun and his colleague Achterfeld (+ 1877) would not agree to this, whereupon the coadjutor-bishop John of Geissel in 1844 withdrew from them the "Venia legendi," that is, the permission to teach.

Traditionalism, as principally developed by Bonald, is diametrically opposed to Hermesianism in that it refers all knowledge, or at least that of religious and moral truth, to tradition, and this tradition itself to a primitive revelation. This erroneous system was also taught by Professor Bautain at Strasburg. He denied that human reason could attain to certainty on religious and moral truths. He did not place the source of certainty in the "sensus communis," as De Lamennais had done, but considered Divine Revelation to be the sole ground of reliance; and the trustworthiness of this he thought could not be proved by reason. Finally, Bautain and his pupils submitted to the judgment of the Church. Similar erroneous views were taught by Bonnetty, who in 1855 subscribed the four theses laid before him by the Holy See. The ontologist Ubaghs in Louvain likewise asserted traditional propositions.

The controversies that arose respecting the philosophy of the secular priest Anthony Günther (+ 1863) induced the Holy See to subject the doctrines of the well-disposed author to a closer examination. His wish to refute pantheism led him to the vain attempt to demonstrate the mysteries of Christianity *a priori*, and to be able to prove and lay them open to comprehension by speculative reasoning; but, as could scarcely be avoided in such speculations, he fell into many errors concerning the relation between the natural and the supernatural. He, however, submitted to the censure of the Pope, Feb. 20, 1857.

Professor Frohschammer of Munich, who had already incurred censure on account of his "Generatianismus" asserted that dogma, being once historically given, became an object of philosophy, and that the latter as well as science itself was absolutely independ-

supernaturalium veritatum cognitionem (statuit)." Cf. Breve *Greg. XVI.* ap. *Densinger*, Enchir. p. 436.

Digitized by Google

ent of revelation and of the authority of the Church. He refused obedience to the decision of the Apostolic See which was given against him, and subsequently fell to the standpoint of pure naturalism.

The empirico-naturalistic system of the Frenchman Auguste Comte, which is called Positivism, denies the possibility of coming at the knowledge of the essence and cause of things, and with this denies all metaphysical and theological science; this system has in our day obtained a widely diffused influence. The notorious Renan (author of the "Life of Jesus") and similar spirits move in the same circle of ideas. But those one-sided theologians who consider Christianity merely as "history," and explain the dogmas as "historical truths," likewise turn their backs on the authority of the Church, and consider historical criticism and science as the supreme judge in matters of faith, thus proving that they belong to a spirit following the same intellectual movement.

The latest controversy on the relation which philosophy bears to theology and on the doctrine of nature and of supernatural existence began, after some previous attacks on scholasticism and the so-called neo-scholastics, between John Kuhn, professor at Tübingen, and James Clemens, professor at Munster, and after the death of the latter was carried on between Kuhn and Constantine von Schätzler (+ 1880), with several new points introduced into the controversy.

In order to bring about a closer union among the learned Catholics of Germany, and adjust their scientific differences, Döllinger, Haneberg, and Alzog convoked a meeting of men of learning and science in the year 1863 at Munich, which it was intended periodically to renew; and it might have become of great importance for philosophy and science had not the discordant tone of a portion of those assembled, and the aversion to ecclesiastical science displayed in the opening speech of Döllinger, rendered any salutary action of the assembly altogether impossible.

In order to oppose the various erroneous opinions which endanger faith and theological science, the Apostolic See, in virtue of its office as supreme teacher, has, on various occasions and lastly at the Vatican, given expression to the correct principles[1] on which theological and philosophical science is based, and within the limits of which the greatest liberty and independence may be exercised without wandering from the paths of faith and of true science. In

[1] Encycl. Pii ad Ep. (Dec. 8, 1864) cum Syllab. (§§ 1, 2). Conc. Vatic. Sess. 3, de fide cath. (Acta et decret. fasc. i. 10 sqq. fasc. ii. 170 sqq.).

Digitized by Google

particular, the Church desires neither a one-sided scholasticism nor any presumptuous ignoring of scholasticism, but rather that the conclusions arrived at by the great theologians of ancient times should be added to the results of modern investigation, and be put to use by serving to explain and defend the truths of faith.

The literature of symbolism and of apologetico-polemical theology, as well as that of the history of dogma,[1] was enriched by many excellent works.

Moral theology[2] was treated of partly as a system, partly as matter of casuistry. In this department St. Alphonsus Liguori,[3] whose works exercise great influence and are of enduring merit, stands high as a leader.

As opposed to the Gallicans, Febronians, and Josephists, the modern canonists[4] again come forward to defend the correct principles based on the articles of faith; and in doing so, decidedly oppose the unjustifiable and deplorable State-churchdom. Although the exegetical writings of the nineteenth century are not equal to the master-works of a Maldonat, etc., they are nevertheless of great importance as bearing on the questions of the day. Catholic exegetical writers devote special attention to the introduction of the Sacred Scriptures, and refute particularly the false assertions of Protestant hypercriticism. In their commentaries on Holy Writ they attend as much to the contents as to the literal explanation of the books of the Old and New Testaments, in doing which they make use of the results of modern philology. The objections drawn from natural science[5] against the trustworthiness of biblical

[1] Histories on dogmas were written by Klee, Zobl, Schwane, Bach (see § 99), Ginoulhiac (see § 32).

[2] As Moralists we may name: Sailer, J. A. Stapf (+ 1844), Hirscher (+ 1865), Bishop Martin, Probst. K. Werner, Fuchs, Jocham, Elger, Rietter (+1866), Schmid, Moufang, Simar, Stein (Pathol.-Moral Principles), Pruner, Müller, Friedhof, Waibel, Hähnlein, Lehmkuhl, Haine, Cardinal Gousset (+1862), Bishop Bouvier (+1854), Bautain (The Morality of the Gospel compared with that of the various Systems of Philosophy), Martinet, Gury (+ 1866), Scavini, Ballerini, Kenrick, A. Konings (+ 1884), Sabetti, Vincent, and others.

[3] On the controversy between the Redemptorists and P. Ballerini, S. J., in reference to the moral theology of St. Alphonsus, see Vindiciae Alphonsianae, etc. Rom. 1873 (The Catholic, 1873, ii. 222 sqq.).

[4] See Vering, Walter, Phillips (+ 1872), Permaneder (+ 1862), Cardinal Gousset, Craisson, Bouix, Tarquini, Grandclaude, De Angelis, De Brabandere, etc.

[5] Bosizio, Wiseman. Other exegetical works and treatises were written by Aberle (+ 1875), Kaulen, Himpel, Bade, Holzammer; the Italians F. X. Patrizi, S. J. Al. Vincenzi, C. Vercellone (+ 1870). The earlier writings of Professors Reusch and

Digitized by Google

narratives receive a thorough refutation. An unmistakable sign of the impetus given in our time to historical studies is, besides the works on universal Church history, the monographs and biographies, the historical works on the Church in separate countries, the histories of the councils and of the religious orders, etc. Special diligence has been accorded to archæological[1] studies; and, since Möhler's time, patrology has been the subject of a more careful treatment.[2]

Liturgical and pastoral theology, as also homilies, and catechetical and pedagogic works, have received an increase in solid productions, the authors of which combine great learning with the ecclesiastical spirit.

The literature of sermons has recently largely increased. Yet with some praiseworthy productions may be found others of but moderate value.

Finally, we must mention the various religious-scientific periodicals, magazines treating on religious subjects, and the like,[3] which have partly been continued in the first half of this century, and partly been called into existence within the last twenty years.

2. Heresies and Schisms.

§ 234. *Theological Tendencies among Protestants.*

While theological studies fell to a very low ebb in most of the Protestant countries, they were eagerly pursued in England and Germany, but at the same time brought prominently forward the interior divisions of Protestantism.

Langen of Bonn, who afterwards apostatized, may here be named. P. Pius Zingerle, Bullers, professor at Giessen, and Bickell, professor at Innsbruck, are distinguished Orientalists.

[1] The works of Binterim, Marchi, S. J., De Rossi, Garucci, S. J., Perret, Le Blant, Martigny, Spencer Northcote, and others, are of great merit.

[2] We mention the works of Lumper, Fessler, Alzog, Permaneder, Nirschl, Hurter, Chevalier, and Villemain.

[3] English periodicals are: The Dublin Review, The Month, The Tablet, The Weekly Register, The Catholic Times, The Irish Ecclesiastical Record, The Irish Monthly, Carlow College Magazine, etc. The most important Italian magazine is La Civittà Cattolica. French periodicals are: Études, Revue des Sciences Ecclésiastiques, Revue Catholique de l'Alsace, Revue Catholique de Louvain. In Spain, the Ciencia Cristiana, edited by the learned Orti y Lara, deserves special mention. There are eleven magazines of great merit in Germany.

Digitized by Google

In the range of the Protestant theology of the nineteenth century hree principal aims are distinguishable, — that of rationalism, of confessionalism (that is, of professing or adhering to some special creed), and of the so-called mediatorial theology, — all of which put forth their pretensions in the various steps of gradation.

The contest of rationalism, which, veiled in a philosophic garb, Kant carried on against supernaturalism, was the occasion of great bitterness; while the so-called rational supernaturalism undertook to mediate between them. But a split took place among the rationalists, some theologians rejecting the rationalism of the "Vulgar," while defending the historico-critical and æsthetic rationalism, without being able to help it in obtaining the victory. Schelling (+ 1854) and Hegel (+ 1831) awakened greater and more sympathetic accordance with the pantheistic ideas, which, being expressed in words similar to those used in Christian phraseology, became naturalized by them in theology. The greatest influence exercised on the new formation of Protestant theology was that of Frederic Schleiermacher (+ 1834), who, in understanding a pantheist and in heart a Christian, gave up systematic teaching and placed religion simply in emotion; whereas his colleague and rival Hegel, equally one-sided, designated the understanding as the seat of religion. Among the adherents of Hegel, whose pantheism was brought into speculative theology by Daub in Heidelberg (+ 1836) and by Marheineke in Berlin (+ 1846), various positions were taken. Those on the "Right" maintained the agreement of their doctrine with Christianity; those on the "Left" denied this. The contradiction of the school of Hegel with positive Christianity was visibly seen in the "Life of Jesus" by David Strauss (+ 1874). Ferdinand Christian Baur (+ 1860), and the "Tübingen School" under his guidance, attempted, as Strauss had done already, to set up Hegel's pantheistic idealism in the place of Christianity.

Related to this aim and object is the "free Protestant theology" of Schenkel, Bunsen, and others, which despoils Christianity of its supernatural character, denies its fundamental truths, and destroys all fervid piety. The last development of rationalistic-infidel views is materialism, which Strauss and Hartmann publicly preached.

As administrator of Lutheran Orthodoxy, Claus Harms (+ 1855) arose in Kiel; his ninety-five Theses raised a great cloud of dust (1817). Hengstenberg, professor in Berlin (+ 1869), in his "Evangelical Gazette," combated, from the year 1827, rationalism and infidelity, while at that time he defended the Union, against which

Digitized by Google

he afterwards turned his weapons. The chief organ of exclusive Lutheranism on the basis of the Formula of Concord is the "Gazette for Lutheran Theology," edited by Guerike and Rudelbach. The gazette established by Harless in Munich, entitled "For Protestantism and Church," represents the interests of Lutheran Orthodoxy.

In contradistinction to the Old Lutherans, the New Lutherans formed a party, without, however, agreeing among themselves. They indeed hold firmly to the justification theory of Luther, the "sola fides;" but with it they associate a sacramental church, with a so-called ordination of the preacher, contrary to the Old Lutheran theory of the invisibility of the Church and of a priesthood common to all Christians. Some theologians of these views — as, for instance, Löhe (+ 1872) — describe the Lord's Supper as the central point of all Christian worship, and place preaching on a much lower footing. The most eminent men belong to the New Lutherans, such as Vilmar in Marburg (+ 1868), K. von Hofmann (+ 1877), and Thomasius (+ 1875) in Erlangen, Kahnis in Leipsic (he however has latterly taken a more rationalistic turn), the Upper Church Counsellor Kliefoth in Schwerin, the Jurists Göschel in Magdeburg (+ 1862) and Stahl in Berlin (+ 1861), the well-known opponent of Bunsen. Although the greater number of the New Lutherans are in no way behind the Old Lutherans in aversion to the Catholic Church, yet they are decried by these last as German Puseyites, and as already standing quite near to the gates of Rome.

In the midst between rationalism and the symbolic faith stands mediatorial theology, which is striving to strike out a path in which Christianity can be reconciled with modern unbelief. The real founder of the sect is Schleiermacher, whose disciples work partially in the views of their master. The most prominent representatives of this system, which in fact gives up every particular form of creed, are Lücke in Göttingen (+ 1855), Nitzsch (+ 1868), Jul. Müller in Halle, Ullmann, at last prelate in Carlsruhe (+ 1864), Twesten and Dorner (+ 1884) in Berlin, Hundeshagen in Bonn (+ 1872), and others. Richard Rothe in Heidelberg (+ 1867), the theologian of the Protestant Union, seeks to mediate between Christianity and modern culture, by surrendering the fundamental truths of the former and letting the Church come forth in the State. These views he sets forth more particularly in his Ethics, in which Christianity appears as "the pure and perfect development of humanity."

Digitized by Google

As in dogma, morals, etc., the various directions taken by the Protestant theologians made themselves felt in the departments of Exegesis, of Church History, and of the branches of learning allied with these.

Rationalism still predominates alike in the explanation of Scripture as in the preliminary sciences; it is, however, successfully combated by the positive theologians, although the writings of these latter are not free from error and one-sidedness. The Bible-work of Bunsen and the still more radical work of Schmid and Holtzendorff represent the views of the ordinary unbelief in the mind of the Protestant Union. Lachmann († 1851) and Tischendorf († 1874) are the best critics of the text.

The necessary information respecting the Protestant learned writers of Church history has already been given in § 2, Vol. I.

The works on Canon Law by Eichhorn († 1854) and Richter († 1864) are of a more positive character and are written with a certain impartiality.

The Cyclopædia of Herzog, in twenty-two volumes, is a Protestant Church lexicon. The second edition is much inferior to the first in every respect.

§ 235. *The Protestant Union and its Results. — Several Shades in Protestantism.*

At the celebration of the Festival of the Reformation Sept. 27, 1817, King Frederic William of Prussia summoned the Lutherans and the Reformed of his kingdom to unite in one "Evangelical Church;" and with this the preachers and congregations of other States, either of their own free-will or at the command of a higher power, joined themselves. The point of unity for this concord, effected on the basis of religious indifferentism and of rationalism, was to be the Church service ("Agenda"), which in 1822 the king prescribed for the Court Church and the military, and in a Protean-like publication (1829) made it also apply to all Protestant churches. Taking part in the Union was at each one's option, but the use of the Church service was strictly enjoined. The opposition of some Lutheran preachers to the Church service was punished by deposition and imprisonment; that of the congregations was broken by military executions. The formation of "separate religious associations" was forbidden. It was not till 1840 that King Frederic William IV. set the imprisoned preachers at liberty. Then sev-

Digitized by Google

eral separate Lutheran congregations were founded, which in 1845 were recognized as sects of the Church. The superintendence of these was undertaken by the Upper Church College in Breslau, under the presidency of the Jurist Huschke. The agreement of the separated Lutherans was not of long duration.

The forcible measures employed by the Bureaucrats could have only an exterior effect. It is easy to understand that the Union, which was repugnant alike to reason and conscience, could not promote ecclesiastical sentiments or domestic piety; it reveals only the interior disorder of Protestantism, and the religious indifference of its members, which alone could render a union of this kind feasible.

In order to give stability to the Union, Frederic William IV. in 1846 convoked a so-called general synod at Berlin, to discuss the questions of creed and constitution. The result was the adoption of the formula of Ordination, drawn up by Nitzsch, which does away with the ecclesiastical creeds, together with the most important truths of the Christian faith. But unity was by no means restored by this; on the contrary, the dissensions among the Protestant sects were increased, and protestations were made on all sides against the "Robber-synod" which had not given "expression to the universal Protestant consciousness."

The assembly convoked by Bunsen at Berlin in 1857, which consisted of deputies of the English Evangelical Alliance and of German Protestant celebrities, was equally unsuccessful; it only called forth protests on all sides against that "All the World's Church," which in respect to indifferentism far exceeded the Union itself.

Other attempts of Protestants to excite animation and to rouse a vital spirit were also failures. The interior mission only exposed them to the scorn and mockery of the rationalistic majority. The Evangelical Conference of 1846, called together by Prussia and Würtemberg could not bring the parties closer together, even on the basis of the most vague indifferentism. The "Church Association," with its Church days, formed by believing preachers at Sandhof, near Frankfort, in 1848, was consistent only in its outbreaks against Rome, while its positive believing tendency had to yield to the infidelity of rationalism. In order to escape this danger, the deputies of the most widely differing sects, who since the year 1852 have assembled in Church conference at Pentecost (at first yearly, then every two years) at the foot of the Wartburg, have avoided the discussion of theological questions, and contented themselves with the prep-

Digitized by Google

aration of statistical notices, of a collection of choice Church hymns, and the correction of Luther's translation of the Bible, to bring it more in accordance with the times. The "first Protestant diet," held in Eisenach, 1864, under the presidency of Bluntschi of Heidelberg and of the Upper Court preacher Schwartz of Gotha, called the German Protestant Union into life. Its purpose was said to be "the renovation of the Protestant Church in the spirit of evangelical freedom and in harmony with the development of culture in our own times." The Union manifested great diligence in undermining every kind of religious tendency. Its members for the most part belong to the extreme unbelieving direction. This unbelief makes itself sufficiently felt in their writings and in their yearly assemblies. In these latter times the Protestant Unioı has fraternized with the so-called Old Catholics

The small fanatical sects of false mysticism which spring from the bosom of Protestantism have attained to no significance.

Out of opposition to the orthodox-pietistic "Men of Darkness," the "Friends of Light," under Uhlich, Wislicenus (+ 1875), Rupp, and others have formed themselves into "free communities," whose creed is that of unbelief.

The proximate occasion for the formation of the association of the Friends of Light was the proceeding of the Consistory of Magdeburg against the preacher Sintenis, who in 1840 declared the worship of Christ to be a blasphemous superstition. The attack made by the "Evangelical Church Gazette" against the assembly of the Friends of Light in Köthen (1844) called forth a theological protest, Aug. 15, 1846, signed by eighty-eight preachers.

In order to come to the support of the "scattered Protestant congregations" and to wage war against the Catholic Church, the Gustavus Adolphus Association was founded in 1841 and 1843. Bavaria forbade it on account of the hateful polemic it carried on against the Catholics. Even Prussia at first would not permit this production of rationalistic indifferentism. The appearance of Rupp, the free-congregation preacher, at the Assembly of Berlin in 1846 caused a division among the associates, which the Assembly of Darmstadt in 1847 sought to remove by vague and meaningless phrases. As far as regards the actual duties of religious life, the Gustavus Adolphus Association, in spite of its large revenues, did nothing to promote their performance; it did but little in support of Protestant congregations, but so much the more did it expend its funds in founding Protestant churches and schools among almost exclusively

Digitized by Google

Catholic populations. The yearly assemblies commonly run through the obligatory attacks on the Catholic Church, and afford an instructive insight into the confusion of opinions that distinguishes modern Protestantism.

§ 236. *Interior State of Protestantism.* — *Sects.*

The most modern history [1] of Protestantism offers but a gloomy picture of interior discord and the rending asunder of sects. The symbolical books have long since been laid aside, and faith is yielding more and more to a growing religious indifferentism. The preachers are divided into several parties, each differing from each; some still adhering to positive Christianity, while others, and indeed the greater part, are wandering in the labyrinths of rationalistic enlightenment, which frequently leads to pantheism. Whole communities, affected by the unchristian flood which poured forth from the Protestant high schools, have at times opposed the appointment of a believing preacher. In consequence of an unbounded subjectivism, which is not checked by any divine teaching authority, Protestantism crumbles more and more into widely divergent sects, of which the only bond that holds them together is one of negation and of protest. Even in Sweden it was useless to try to suppress, by police regulations and legal penalties, the opposition offered by the Pietists (called "Läsare," or Bible readers and readers of Luther's works) to the "defunct orthodoxy." Under Oscar II. (1873) the dissidents were, with certain limitations, permitted the public exercise of their religion.

The United States of America constitute a most fertile field for the formation of sects. Here, where the principle of the complete separation of Church and State [2] is recognized, where religious communities are regarded by the Government as civil corporations, where nationalities from various countries aggregate, religious views of every shape have been introduced or have originated: new sects, like new temporal societies, are continually springing up. Besides Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, German Lutherans, there are many others, whose number could be with difficulty accurately ascertained. The frequent revivals, though conducted with every appearance of zeal and enthusiasm, and productive of

[1] *Dorner*, Hist. of Protestant Theology. *Jörg*. Hist. of Protestantism. *Döllinger*, Church and Churches. Catholic Quarterly Review, July, 1885.

[2] See Catholic World, February, 1885, p. 592.

Digitized by Google

momentary accessions (conversions so-called), have no permanent result with regard to dogmatic teaching. Outside of the Catholic Church, the great bulk of Americans are indifferent to distinctive dogmas of faith, which indifferentism is fostered by the pursuits of a merely secular education in the public schools of the country. They have some vague conceptions of fundamental religious truth, beyond which they indulge in free thinking with regard to matters of faith. The good qualities for which they are praised are to a great extent the effects of natural generosity and benevolent feelings. There are a considerable number who disavow all positive faith and openly profess infidelity.

In England, also, sects spring up like mushrooms. There are said to be now more than one hundred and fifty known forms of religion. The Episcopal or Established Church, besides the High Church party, counts among its clergy many members of the Low Church party called the Evangelicals, who adhere to Calvinism, consider the sacraments as mere signs or symbols, and incline to the Dissenters. Of the Tractarians we have spoken in § 230. A third party within the National Church is the Broad Church party, countenanced more or less by the late Dean Stanley, by Professor Jowet and Canon Farrars; this party, which has been developed under the influence of German literature and theology, denies the intrinsic value of dogmatic teachings and indulges in a rationalistic Christianity. The Puseyites, called also the Ritualists, are almost the only ones who are scientifically active; they, believing in the catholicity of the English Church, seek to restore the ancient practices. They introduce ecclesiastical ceremonies, adopt the doctrines of the seven sacraments, of transubstantiation, of the sacrifice of the Mass, establish religious orders, defend celibacy, etc. The Privy Council, which since 1833 has been the supreme court of appeal in matters of doctrine and discipline, and consists mainly of laymen, forbade in 1869 all those forms of worship not expressly sanctioned. In the convocation of clergy in the year 1872 there were four hundred and forty-three Anglican clergymen who demanded the reintroduction of confession, of masses for the dead, and of the invocation of the Blessed Virgin. The Archbishop of Canterbury introduced a law against the Ritualists in Parliament, the passing of which, however, did not prevent the movement from progressing. The Ritualists belong to the Great Union in the English Church, and always come forward to defend any clergyman prosecuted under the act for the regulation of public worship. A section of the

Digitized by Google

Ritualists are generously inclined towards the Apostolic See, and many of them have already joined the Church. Rationalism is, however, gaining ground more and more in the Anglican Church, as is manifest in the controversies of Hampden and Gorham. The essays and reviews, seven in number, published in 1860 under the editorial supervision of Jowet, Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, are a virtual denial of divine revelation. The Anglican clergy protested against them; the Privy Council, however, among whom were several Anglican dignitaries, acquitted their authors. Dr. Colenso (+ 1883), Bishop of Natal in southeastern Africa, who wrote against the authenticity of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua, was likewise acquitted. The supernatural theology of Professor Leely at Cambridge is written from the standpoint of Darwin. Religious indifference shows itself also in the fact that dissenters are buried by Anglican clergymen according to the form prescribed by the funeral liturgy. The divorce-law of 1858 met with but slight opposition from the Anglican bishops. The richly endowed Anglican clergy quietly bear the yoke of State despotism, and take but little heed of the lower classes, who in many instances grow up without any sense of vital religion.

The Anglican Church, broad in theory as in practice, embraces ultra-Protestants and free-thinkers.[1] Its disestablishment can be only a question of time. In Ireland such disestablishment has already taken place; the motions introduced for doing this in England, which have been brought before Parliament, have not as yet received the assent of the majority. In Scotland, in 1843, about two hundred preachers (non-Intrusionists), together with their congregations, seceded from the Establishment of that country, the Kirk, and organized the General Assembly of the Free Kirk of Scotland. Within seventeen years this Free Kirk has built upwards of eight hundred churches, with parsonages and schools, by free contributions; and the adherents thereto soon comprised a third of the population. Dr. Chalmers (+ 1847) led the primal movement.

English Dissenters, who for the most part belong to the middle classes, are chiefly divided into those of a rationalistic and those of a visionary tendency. They acknowledge no church authority and no firmly established symbols of faith or of religious exercises. Their worship consists mainly in preaching, and the preachers are entirely dependent on their congregations. The Old Presbyterians have for the most part merged into socinianism. The Baptists

[1] See Catholic World, September, 1880.

Digitized by Google

administer baptism to adults alone, and by complete immersion. The Old Quakers and Methodists maintain their previous standing, although lately, among the latter, contentions respecting the constitution have broken out, which have caused secessions. A branch of these are called "Momiers" in Geneva, and the "Revived" in France. The Independents, or Congregationalists, reject every doctrinal type, and desire that the preacher should conform to the views of his congregation, especially of the wealthier and more influential members. Yet all Dissenters have retained the easy Protestant theory on justification.

The Plymouth Brethren, called Darbyites from John Darby (+ 1882), and the Irvingites, founded by Edward Irving, preacher at the Scotch National Church, London, maintain that even in the apostolic age the true Church of God had been disfigured. The former of these reject every church, and edify themselves by the "gifts of the Holy Ghost which have remained with them." The latter desire, with the help of the Holy Ghost, newly poured out upon them, to restore the original purity of Christianity. The Irvingite sect found adherents even in Germany, among whom is the Pietist theologian Thiersch (+ Dec. 3, 1885), professor of Marburg. In some doctrinal points they resemble the Catholic Church, while they strictly condemn the principle of Protestantism.

The sect of the Mormons, or the Free Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, was founded in North America by Joseph Smith[1] (+ 1844). He was born in the beginning of this century in the State of Vermont, of disreputable parents, and was always a visionary. In 1830 he proclaimed that in September, 1827, he had received from an angel the records of the earliest inhabitants of America, engraven on golden plates; this record he affirmed was once written by the prophet Mormon, who buried the plates in the earth. The document has been proved to be nearly a literal transcript of an unprinted romance written by Solomon Spalding at the beginning of this century. After several wanderings, Smith's adherents, who from a small beginning have increased to considerable numbers, settled in 1847 on the shores of Salt Lake, in the present Territory of Utah, and under Smith's successor, Brigham Young (+ 1877), founded the New Jerusalem, a Theo-democracy, of which Brigham Young became president. They have introduced

[1] Besides the numerous periodicals and pamphlets in various languages, the principal Mormon works are the "Book of Mormons" and the "Book of Doctrine and Covenants." "Mormon Portraits," by Dr. *W. Wyl.*

Digitized by Google

polygamy as a distinctive institution, and also have a partial community of goods. The sect is very similar to Mahometanism. From Utah they send out missionaries to every part of the world to make converts. The land they inhabit was created a Territory by Congress in 1850; the number of inhabitants in 1880 was 143,963, most of whom were emigrants from Great Britain and from the European Continent. In 1871 action was taken in the courts of the United States against polygamy as a criminal offence, and the entire suppression of Mormonism is the outspoken desire of many American citizens.

In 1845, in England, the Evangelical Alliance was founded by High-churchmen and Dissenters, on the broad basis of their common principles of Christianity, in order to check the progress of the Catholic Church in the kingdom. The meetings of this association,[1] which were also attended by French, German, and other Protestants, clearly attest the internal distractions that disturb Protestantism, together with the sentiments of many of its adherents towards the Catholic Church.

Recently a new sect, known as "The Salvation Army," has arisen.

To attain a closer and more accurate knowledge of the present interior state of German Protestantism, it may be well carefully to consider the following points: —

1. Contrary to the practice of old Protestantism, which looked upon the sermon as the main point of divine service, many efforts are now being made to establish a liturgical service, of which the Eucharist is to form the central point. Intimately connected with this innovation is that of kneeling at divine service, and the adorning of churches with the pictures of saints, together with the introduction of choral chant. To this may be added the bringing in of a sort of confession, of a stricter observance of Church discipline, the reformation of rationalistic hymn-books and liturgies, the holding daily service, etc., all of which are zealously advocated in behalf of a religious life by preachers and at ecclesiastical assemblies. So far, however, all these attempts at reform, which are but husks without the kernel, have been frustrated by the opposition of the majority of the Protestants, who are either hostile or indifferent to such endeavors.[2]

2. Equally unsuccessful have been the attempts to replace the vague and indifferent catechisms by better works.[3] The party of the Protestant Union have in these later days made the attempt to banish every profession of faith

[1] See Quarterly Review, January, 1874.

[2] *Jörg.* Hist. of Protestantism, etc., i. 513 sqq.

[3] Controversy on Catechisms and Hymnals in the Palatinate of the Rhine (1853–1859).

Digitized by Google

— that is, of Christianity — from the catechism, and unfortunately have in some degree succeeded.[1]

3. The internal dissolution of Protestantism is also shown by the fact that preachers like Ewald in Darmstadt, Lisco and Sydow in Berlin (1872), openly announce their infidelity without the ecclesiastical authorities venturing to take energetic measures to oppose them. The sentence of deposition pronounced by the Consistory against Sydow, who had denied the divinity of Christ, was immediately rescinded by the Upper Ecclesiastical Council, as no "official offence" had been laid to his charge. Against Sydow's deposition twenty-six clergymen of the Province of Brandenburg and twelve preachers of Berlin protested. In like manner the preacher Schröder, deposed in 1871 by the Consistory of Wiesbaden for infidelity, was reinstated in January, 1874, by Falk, the Minister of Worship. The plea of the theologians of Jena, in the address which they, together with the professors and preachers, signed and presented to the Minister of Worship in Sydow's favor, was made "in the interest of freedom for teaching."

4. When the Prussian May-laws appeared in 1873, it was but a very insignificantly small proportion of the Protestant preachers who protested against the underlying principles, and these immediately recognized the duty of obeying the laws. Not a single Protestant protest was made against the Hessian Church-laws.

5. The edict regarding the constitution of the Evangelical Church in the Grand Duchy of Hesse ordains, in division 2, § 10, that Lutheran clergymen must administer the Sacraments also to any of the reformed who may have settled in their parish, and *vice versa*. Only four or five clergymen sacrificed their positions to their conscience; the others yielded.

6. The question of constitution forms a very sore spot in Protestantism. The supreme episcopate of the ruler is now in many respects limited by congregational representatives in the so-called synods, who have been introduced after the Calvinistic model. The events in Hesse (1873), Prussia (1875), and Baden (1876) prove that the liberal tendency in the spirit of the Protestant Union predominates alike in small circles and in the general synods.

7. With regard to religious life among the Protestants we may judge from the ever-increasing neglect of divine service, the sensibly decreasing number of theological students, their indifference towards baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Christian burial, etc. Since the introduction of civil marriage, a considerable number of Protestants neglect ecclesiastical matrimony altogether, and do not even have their children baptized.

§ 237. *The Sect of the Rongeans and of the so-called Old Catholics.*

The "French-Catholic Church" of the Abbé Chatel (+ 1857) and the "Apostolic Catholic Church" of the Abbé Helsen in Brussels

[1] See the Synod of Baden of 1876.

Digitized by Google

(+1842) find a worthy rival in the "German Catholic" Sect. The originators of this sect are the suspended priests John Ronge and Czerski; their fundamental principle is a denial of Christianity. The movement began with a provocative public letter written by Ronge to Arnoldi (+1864), Bishop of Treves, on the occasion of the pilgrimage to Treves for the veneration of the "Holy Coat" of the Savior. The first synod, at Leipsic, in 1845, gave expression to religious Nihilism. Some governments, especially Prussia, favored the "Catholic dissenters" (!); others closed their territory to them. The movement soon assumed larger dimensions. Ronge was hailed as a "second Luther," the infidel press applauded the sentiment, and Protestant preachers offered his adherents the joint use of their churches; but this incense of victory was soon followed by more sober feelings. The hopes which Protestants had conceived of a revolution against the Catholic Church, headed by men so insignificant and for the most part so greatly depraved, were not fulfilled; and finally Protestantism experienced the result of such a movement when Ronge, Dowiat, and others, in 1848, carried their revolutionary church principles into political life. This cooled the zeal of many statesmen for the sect, which is now verging towards complete extinction. Many who had been deceived (among whom was Dowiat) have returned to the Church, and but few congregations are now left to linger on in a precarious existence.

The sect of the "Old Catholics," so-called, took its rise in the opposition made to the Vatican Council. Döllinger was the principal leader in the movement. It began with the denial of papal infallibility, whence it passed rapidly to the rejection of the ecclesiastical office of teaching in general; it then changed the constitution and discipline of the Church in many essential points, introduced innovations into the liturgy, and entered into connection with infidel and anti-ecclesiastical parties. The sectarians were highly favored and aided in Germany[1] and Switzerland[2] by the temporal power, because they were expected to become useful in-

[1] In 1873 the governments of Prussia, Baden, and Hesse recognized the apostate priest Jos. Hubert Reinkens, who had been consecrated by the Jansenist bishop Heydecamp of Deventer as a Catholic bishop. Prussia granted an annuity of sixteen thousand thalers for his maintenance, and for "Old Catholic" purposes Baden added two thousand thalers thereto.

[2] In Switzerland the sectaries organized themselves into a Christian Catholic Church. Herzog, an apostate priest, was elected bishop, and was consecrated by Reinkens.

Digitized by Google

struments in promoting the so-called "Cultur-kampf." This hope, however, failed entirely; and the sect, which did not rise even to so much significance as had been attained by that of the "German Catholics," is already in that state of internal dissolution which promises a speedy extinction.

§ 238. *The Schismatic Churches of the East.*

The Orthodox Church of Anodoli, or Natolia, has undergone the fate of a branch lopped from the living and life-giving vine.

The Schismatic Church of Constantinople is striding nearer and nearer to its final dissolution. The greater number of the churches connected with this patriarchate have already rendered themselves independent of it; there are not more than nine millions of schismatics who acknowledge fealty to its head. The Patriarch of Constantinople exercises an extensive, nay, almost an unlimited jurisdiction over his subjects. At his pleasure he can install or depose bishops, assign punishments, and impose taxes upon clergy and people. The appointment to the patriarchate takes place, with scarcely an exception, through simony, and it is seldom that a patriarch dies while yet in possession of his see. Most patriarchs after a short reign are deposed by the synod, or compelled to resign their episcopal dignity, which others have purchased with money. The clergy are ignorant, and in oppressive dependence on the bishops, who often desecrate their holy office by exactions of money, simony, and the like. The Popes, especially Pius IX. and Leo XIII., have repeatedly sought measures to deliver the Church of the East, so venerable in ancient times, from her disgraceful condition. The schismatic patriarchs have preferred to submit their ecclesiastical arrangements to the Turk rather than to the successor of St. Peter.

The Russian Church stands altogether under the dominion of the Czar. The bishops are dependent on the Holy Synod in all matters. The popes (as the Russian priests are termed) are exposed to their caprice, and for the most part are without high education; they frequently live in very oppressive poverty. The conduct of divine service often degenerates into a mere mechanical ritualism. Among the higher classes Voltairism holds the sway, while the lower classes are the prey of ignorance and superstition. Sectarianism, in spite of the legal penalties imposed by imperialism, makes great progress, and the decay of morals is becoming more and more common.

Digitized by Google

The "Orthodox Oriental Church" of Hellas, in the year 1833, proclaimed its independence of the patriarchate of Constantinople, and in the year 1850 obtained the recognition of the same from the patriarch. Its guide is the "Permanent Synod," which consists of spiritual and secular members. The clergy and people are governed by moral and religious conditions similar to those existing in Russia.

III. WORSHIP AND DISCIPLINE.

§ 239. *Divine Service. — Christian Life.*

THE later liturgical directions[1] refer chiefly to the worthy celebration of divine service, especially to the more accurate observance of the Rubrics. Ordinances have also been issued by the Church respecting ecclesiastical chant, now enjoying a particular cultivation by the societies organized in honor of St. Cecilia. To the great satisfaction of Pius IX., almost all the bishops of France reintroduced the Roman liturgy in their dioceses. The dogmatical declaration of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary (1854) reflected a lustre of higher dignity on this festival, for which a new office and a new Mass was prescribed by Pius IX. in a bull of Sept. 25, 1863. The decree on the veneration of relics (Dec. 10, 1863) confirmed the edict that had been previously issued on April 10, 1668, by the Congregation of Rites, regarding the phials of blood ("ampullae sanguinolentae, phialae cruentae") found in the Catacombs;[2] yet it did not put an end to the controversy as to whether these are to be accepted as certain proofs of martyrdom. The number of the feasts of saints was increased by several beatifications and canonizations. By a decree of the year 1856, Pius IX. extended the celebration of the festival of the Most Sacred Heart of Jesus[3] to the whole Church, and through a decree of Dec. 8, 1870,

[1] They are collected by Gardellini (Decreta authentica congreg. sac. rituum ex actis ejusd. collecta ab 1588–1856). 4 vols. Romae, 1856 sqq.

[2] It determines: "Cum de notis disceptaretur, ex quibus verae sanctorum Martyrum reliquiae a falsis et dubiis cognosci possint, eadem Congregatio censuit, Palmam et vas illorum sanguine tinctum pro signis certissimis habenda esse: aliorum vero signorum examen in aliud tempus rejecit. On the controversy, see *De Rossi*, Roma sotteranea, iii. 707 sqq. *Kraus*, Roma sotter. 2d ed. p. 507 sqq.

[3] *Nilles*, De rationibus festorum sacr. Cordis Jesu et purissimi Cordis Mariae. Innsbr. 1869. (2d ed.)

Digitized by Google

and one of July 7, 1871, the Pope (Pius IX.) elected St. Joseph as patron of the whole Catholic Church.

The united Oriental Church, together with her rites and discipline, is a cherished object of papal solicitude. By the brief "Romani pontifices," of Jan. 6, 1862, a special congregation was appointed to take charge of the affairs of this Oriental Church.

Among the regulations for the promotion of discipline in this era, may be briefly mentioned those on religious orders, on mixed marriages, on the repealing of certain ancient censures, on indulgences,[1] and the like. Strict prohibitory measures appeared respecting the disorders caused by the practice of magnetism. The civil-marriage law introduced by the Revolution into France in 1789, and at a later date in other countries also,[2] was met by decided disapproval on the part of the Church.

Art was again employed in the service of the Church, and excellent works were produced in the domain of architecture,[3] sculpture,[4] painting,[5] and poetry;[6] while, on the other hand, irreligious artists, such as Kaulbach (+ 1874 at Munich), used their talent to express their false ideals.

As far as regards the religious and moral life of this era, it is not to be denied that the French Revolution produced evil effects on public and family life, in the perceptible endeavor to strip marriage, school, and civil legislation of their Christian character, and to substitute revolutionary and anti-Christian principles. Yet religious life received a gladdening impulse in the fact that eminent ecclesiastics and laymen[7] became enthusiastic in promoting and encour-

[1] Decreta authentica S. congr. Indulgentiis sacrisque reliquiis praepositae ab anno 1668 ad annum 1882. Ratisbon, 1883.

[2] §§ 223, 226, 227.

[3] Among the celebrated architects we may name Viollet-le-Duc, the two brothers Melchior and Sulpice Boisserée, the Englishman Pugin the elder, Hübsch, Schmid, Cuypers, and others.

[4] Among sculptors were Canova (+ 1822), Schwanthaler (+ 1848), Eberhard (+ 1858), Ackerman (+ 1883 at Rome), and others. Thorwaldsen, a Dane (+ 1844) was a famous Protestant sculptor.

[5] In this connection we may mention Fred. Overbeck (+ 1869), Cornelius (+ 1867), Philip Veit (+ 1877), and Schadow.

[6] Thomas Moore (+ 1834), Faber (+ 1863), Frederic Schlegel (+ 1829), Clement Brentano (+ 1842), Baron of Eichendorff (+ 1857), Weber, Manzoni (+ 1873), Silvio Pellico, and others.

[7] In Germany, the noble convert and historian Leopold Count of Stolberg (+ 1819), and Jos. Görres (+ 1848), were eminent men at the beginning of this century.

Digitized by Google

aging true religion and morality, while but an insignificant portion of the clergy[1] adhered to the neological views of the past century.

The numerous societies that have arisen under the guidance of the Church, in order to serve her interests, are a gratifying evidence of the Christian spirit; while the new congregations that devote themselves to the instruction of youth, to the care of the sick or other works of charity, testify that religion is not dead. Other manifestations of this may be seen in the frequent reception of the Holy Sacraments, the various congregations in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the very great interest shown by the people in missions and by the clergy in retreats, the great number of the faithful who enter the third order of St. Francis of Assisi, the almost universal propagation of the Confraternity of the Sacred Heart of Mary for the conversion of sinners, the Apostleship of Prayer (highly commended by the Holy See), the Association of Christian Mothers, the numerous pilgrimages, and, finally, the dedication of the whole Catholic world to the divine heart of Jesus.

The sentiments of Catholics throughout the world are also manifested in the grand effusions of fidelity and love for the Holy See that are constantly pouring forth, in the cheerful alacrity with which Peter's pence are paid, and in the numerous deputations continually going to Rome to pay homage to the Vicar of Christ in the name of millions of Catholics, — an homage formerly paid to Pius IX., and now continued to his successor, Leo XIII.

Nor has our era been lacking in phenomena of a supernatural order.[2]

But, on the other hand, the enemies of the Church have not been idle. Infidelity and immorality prevail in many forms among the industrial classes at the very moment that the high aristocracy are again turning toward the Church. The infidel press distributes the

[1] On the two brothers Anthony and Augustus Theiner, —the former of whom died as a "German Catholic," the latter was converted and became an Oratorian, — see *Roskovány*, Rom. pontif. iv. 583 sqq.

[2] The miracle of the Stigmata was conferred, among others, on Catherine Emmerich († 1824), on Maria Mörl († 1868), and on Louise Lateau († 1883). The apparition of the Blessed Virgin Mary at La Salette (1846) and at Lourdes (1858) has been confirmed by many miracles. The Jew Alphonse M. Ratisbonne († 1884), who in union with his brother conducted the association of Notre Dame de Sion, was converted by a miraculous apparition of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Madonna of Rimini by a movement of the eyes preannounced the disasters that were to come upon Italy (1858). On the shrines of the Blessed Virgin in various countries of Europe, see *Spencer Northcote*.

Digitized by Google

most filthy and frivolous papers without being disturbed. Pamphlets and illustrated newspapers and magazines destructive of all ecclesiastical and political order have full range; they raise doubts, and question every state of property and possession, while they aim at the equalization of all social conditions, as appeared in a most appalling manner during the "Commune," after the late war of France with Germany.

A public state of irreligion is equally obvious in the systematic attempts made to unchristianize the schools. The change of schools conducted by the representatives of various creeds into the common schools from which religion is excluded, the expulsion of the orders devoted to teaching, and the modern school-laws (in Germany) violate the most sacred rights of the parents, who are compelled to surrender their children to such institutions; although by doing so, they betray the interests of the Church, which is thus denied the supervision of the schools which for the most part she herself had founded. The higher instruction is, even more than that of the lower grade, tyrannized over by the modern State, which admits atheistic and materialistic professors to the chairs of the University, who instil into the minds of the youthful students the poison of infidelity and immorality. To counteract this evil, free Catholic universities have been founded in some countries;[1] the effort to effect this in Germany has not as yet been successful, although in that country there is urgent need of a higher institution of learning freed from State monopoly.

While the heralds of impiety and of revolution unscrupulously cast off the mask, and unveil plans which they seek to carry out by international combinations, the legislative halls are filled with men struck with spiritual blindness, who are full of hatred towards the Church, — men who are over-eager in their haste to forge new chains with which to fetter the only institution on earth that is able to help the world.

Thus is it with the public affairs of our era! The world is divided into two camps. Belief and unbelief, Christianity and anti-Christianity, are waging a gigantic warfare one with the other. Albeit this contest must necessarily result in the victory of the Church over the kingdom of Satan, yet may great tribulations and hard trials come upon mankind, thus estranged from God, until it

[1] The Catholics of the United States of North America, under the guidance of their ecclesiastical superiors, have lately taken energetic steps to establish a Catholic University in their country. A great promoter of this long-cherished project is the eminent bishop of Peoria, Rt. Rev. J. L. Spalding.

Digitized by Google

casts off its seducers and penitently returns to the arms of Mother-Church.

§ 240. *Concluding Remarks.*

As throughout the previous centuries, so also during the last three hundred years, the Church, as history proves, has ever been faithful to her divine mission in every respect.

What the Church has done for the conversion of heathen lands is proved by the missions, which flourished anew in the sixteenth century, and extended over the Old World as well as the New; so that the Church, purified from her withered branches, now stretches forth its fruit-bearing boughs from a tree fresh with life, over the five divisions of the world,[1] and everywhere the gospel is preached.

While in the Middle Ages the Popes were contending bravely for the independence of the Church against Cæsarian-papism, and not without success, the Reformers (so-called) did not hesitate to subject their churches to that princely power which then took the place of the divinely ordained authority.

The example of Protestant regents exercised an evil influence on Catholic potentates. Perverted court-canonists applied Protestant principles to the Catholic Church, and absolute princes endeavored to carry them out. Even some spiritual princes in Germany set the pernicious example of disrespect and disobedience to the Apostolic See; and instead of genuine Catholic science, sought to substitute their barren enlightenment, injuring and offending the faithful people by their ordinances respecting the manner in which divine service was to be performed.

The French Revolution buried the anti-ecclesiastical plans under the ruins of the old State system; but after political order had been once more restored, the conflict with the Church was renewed, in which Bureaucrats as well as Liberals took part, as the events of the last years have plainly shown.

How little the rights of the Church are observed in Germany is obvious from the fact that the Protestant majorities give laws to the Catholic Church, and treat her formally as an institution of the State; while in other lands under Catholic regents, "liberal" governments place obstacles to the liberty of the Church and violate her rights.

Amid these storms Pope Pius IX., undismayed by the confusion of the ideas of the age, repeatedly spoke of the mutual relationships that should exist between the spiritual and temporal powers, and

[1] John xv. 1 sqq.

Digitized by Google

showed how detrimental[1] to the one as to the other would be the severance of these two powers.

It is cheering and consoling to witness the manifold and striking manifestations of the interior sympathies and harmonious accordance of the episcopate and the Catholic people with the Apostolic See, whose supremacy and authority are celebrated most gloriously, most triumphantly, precisely at the period when the Pope is oppressed and persecuted.

The progress made in Catholic science during this period is proved by the copious literature in the departments of theological and profane discipline in various countries.

The heresies of the last three hundred centuries have laid a destructive hand on the organization of the Church, and have occasioned a great confusion among the faithful, of whom no inconsiderable number have succumbed to their seductive force; they have called forth devastating wars, and have worked injuriously on religious life, notwithstanding that they have encountered the fate of the heretical doctrines of the earlier ages, and have dissolved themselves in innumerable sects, of which some have already thrown Christianity overboard.

The invincible power of life possessed by the Church, particularly in the numerous religious communities, the members of which occupy themselves with the corporal as well as the spiritual well-being of mankind, is manifested on all sides. When hostile governments drive them from their possessions and their country in one part of the world, they are received with open arms, by other nations, Christian and heathen, and welcomed as benefactors.

As for the rest, the Church, which from her foundation to the present hour has, according to the prophecy[2] of her Divine founder, and like unto Himself, overcome the world amid tribulation and persecution, must still continue to the end her pilgrimage amid the hostilities of the world, fortified by the consolations of God,[3] until both the militant and the suffering Church become absorbed in the triumph of the New Jerusalem, where neither death nor mourning, neither complaint nor pain, can be forevermore.[4]

[1] Syllabus, § 6, No. 39 sqq.
[2] John xvi. 33.
[3] Aug. Civ. Dei, lib. xviii. c. 51.
[4] Apoc. xxi. 4.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF POPES

FROM BENEDICT XI. TO LEO XIII.

Benedict XI., 1303–1304.
Clement V.,[1] 1305–1314.
John XXII., 1316–1334.
Benedict XII., 1334–1342.
Clement VI., 1342–1352.
Innocent VI., 1352–1362.
Urban V., 1362–1370.
Gregory XI., 1370–1378.
Urban VI.,[2] 1378–1389.
Boniface IX., 1389–1404.
Innocent VII., 1404–1406.
Gregory XII., 1406; resigned, 1415.

POPES OF PISA.

Alexander V., 1409–1410; and John XXIII., 1410–1415.

Martin V., 1417–1431.
Eugene IV., 1431–1447.
(Anti-Pope Felix V., 1439–1448.)
Nicholas V., 1447–1455.
Calixtus III., 1455–1458.
Pius II., 1458–1464.
Paul II., 1464–1471.
Sixtus IV., 1471–1484.
Innocent VIII., 1484–1492.
Alexander VI., 1492–1503.
Pius III., † 1503.
Julius II., 1503–1513.
Leo X., 1513–1521.
Adrian VI., 1522–1523.
Clement VII., 1523–1534.
Paul III., 1534–1549.
Julius III., 1550–1555.
Marcellus II., † 1555 (reigned twenty-one days).
Paul IV., 1555–1559.
Pius IV., 1559–1565.
St. Pius V., 1566–1572.
Gregory XIII., 1572–1585.
Sixtus V., 1585–1590.
Urban VII., † 1590 (reigned thirteen days).
Gregory XIV., † 1591 (reigned ten months and ten days).
Innocent IX., † 1591 (reigned two months).
Clement VIII., 1592–1604.
Leo XI., † 1605 (reigned thirteen days).
Paul V., 1605–1621.
Gregory XV., 1621–1623.
Urban VIII., 1623–1644.
Innocent X., 1644–1655.
Alexander VII., 1655–1667.
Clement IX., 1667–1669.
Clement X., 1670–1676.
Innocent XI., 1676–1689.
Alexander VIII., 1689–1691.

[1] The Popes from Clement V. to Gregory XI. resided at Avignon.

[2] Robert of Geneva (Clement VII., 1378–1394) opposed Urban VI. as anti-Pope. His successor was Peter de Luna (Benedict XIII., † 1424).

Digitized by Google

Innocent XII., 1691–1700.
Clement XI., 1700–1721.
Innocent XIII., 1721–1724.
Benedict XIII., 1724–1730.
Clement XII., 1730–1740.
Benedict XIV., 1740–1758.
Clement XIII., 1758–1769.
Clement XIV., 1769–1774.
Pius VI., 1775–1799.
Pius VII., 1800–1823.
Leo XII., 1823–1829.
Pius VIII., 1829–1830.
Gregory XVI., 1830–1846.
Pius IX., 1846–1878.
Leo XIII., Feb. 20, 1878.

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS

FROM THE COUNCIL OF VIENNE TO THAT OF THE VATICAN.

15. The Council of Vienne (1311).
16. The Council of Constance (1414).
17. The Council of Basle and Florence (1431).
18. The Fifth Council in the Lateran (1511).
19. The Council of Trent (1545).
20. The Council in the Vatican (1869).

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, AND IMPORTANT EVENTS.

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.		ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	EAST ROMAN.	WEST ROMAN, AND GERMAN KINGS.[1]			
Benedict XI., Oct. 22, 1303, to July 7, 1304. Conclave of 11 months.				*Capetians.* Philip IV., 1285–1314.	
Clement V., June 5, 1305, to April 20, 1314.			*Plantagenet.* Edward II., 1307–1327.		1305. Clement V. crowned at Lyons on Nov. 14. 1306. He yields to the wishes of Philip the Fair. 1307. Fra Dolcino executed. Persecutions of the Templars.
		Henry VII., 1308 (1312)–1313.			1308. John Duns Scotus †. Albert of Austria †. The Church of the Lateran is destroyed by fire. 1309. Beginning of the Captivity of Babylon (1309–1378). Censures against Venice. The Knights of St. John at Rhodes. 1311–1312. Fifteenth Œcumenical Council at Vienne. Suppression of the Templars. Condemnation of the Fraticelli, Apostolicals, Beghards, and Beguines.
Vacancy of 2 years. John XXII., Aug. 7, 1316, to Dec. 4, 1334.		*Frederic of Austria, 1313–1330. *Louis IV., 1313–1347.		Louis X., 1314–1316. John I., 1316. Philip I., 1316–1322.	1313. Henry VII. against Robert of Naples. 1314. Double election in Germany. 1315. Raymond Lullus is stoned to death. 1316. Ægidius of Rome †. 1317 sqq. Conflict of the Pope with the Fratricelli. 1320. J. A. Andreä †. 1321. Dante †.
				Charles IV., 1322–1328.	1322. Victory of Louis the Bavarian over Frederic of Austria. Petrus Aureolus †. 1323. Monitorium against Louis the Bavarian. Herveus Natalis †.
Anti-Pope Nicholas V., 1328–1330.	Andronicus III., 1328–1341.		Edward III., 1327–1377.	*Valois.* Philip II. of Valois, 1328–1350.	1324. Excommunication of King Louis. 1325. Francis Mayronis †. 1327. Congress of Trent. 1328. Marsilius of Padua †. 1330. Frederic of Austria †. 1333. Durandus of St. Pourçayn †.

Digitized by Google

Benedict XII., Dec. 20, 1334, to April 25, 1342.					1336. Bull "Benedictus Deus." The Greek monk Barlaam comes to Avignon. 1338. Meeting of the Electors at Frankfort and Rhense. 1341. Nicholas de Lyra †.
Clement VI., May 7, 1342, to Dec. 6, 1352.	John V. Palæologus under the guardianship of his mother Anne, together with John IV. Cantacuzene, 1341–1355.	Charles IV., 1347 (1355)–1378.			1342. Petrus de Palude †. 1343. Severe bull against Louis the Bavarian. 1347. King Louis and William Occam †. Cola di Rienzi at Rome. 1348. Black Plague. Foundation of the University of Prague. 1349. Thomas Bradwardine †. Günther of Schwarzburg †.
Innocent VI., Dec. 18, 1352, to Sept. 22, 1362.	John V., alone, 1355–1391.			John II., 1350–1364.	1350. John Buridan †. Fifty years' jubilee. 1352. First capitulation of election in the conclave. 1354. Cola di Rienzi murdered. 1355–1356. Golden Bull. 1357–1358. The greatest part of the States of the Church regained by Albornoz. 1360. Wycliffe disquiets England. 1361. John Tauler †.
Urban V., Oct. 28, 1362, to Dec. 19, 1370.				Charles V., 1364–1380.	1364. The Jesuates approved. 1365. Alexandria taken by the Crusaders. Henry Suso †. 1367. The Pope leaves Avignon. Cardinal Albornoz †. 1368. Charles IV. at Rome. 1369. John Palæologus at Rome.
Gregory XI., Dec. 30, 1370, to March 27, 1378.					1370. Return of the Pope to Avignon. Papal decision against Wycliffe. 1373. St. Bridget of Sweden †. 1374. John Milic †. Petrarca †. 1375. Boccaccio †. 1376. Interdict against Florence. Return of the Pope to Rome.
Urban VI., April, 1378, to Oct. 15, 1389. Clement VII. (Robert of Geneva), anti-Pope, Sept. 20, 1378, to Sept. 16, 1394.		*Wenceslaus, 1378–1400.	Richard II., 1377–1399.	Charles VI., 1380–1422.	1377. Wycliffe cited before an ecclesiastical court. 1379. Victory of the adherents of Urban over those of Clement. The anti-Pope resides at Avignon. 1380. St. Catherine of Siena †. King Charles V. of France †. 1381. John Ruysbroek †. The University of Paris demands an œcumenical council. Charles of Durazzo crowned King of Naples by Urban. 1382. Louis of Anjou crowned by the anti-Pope. Two synods declare against Wycliffe. 1384. Gerard Groote †. Louis of Anjou †. Urban VI. at Nocera. 1385. Urban besieged at Nocera, then at Genoa.

[1] The German Kings who are not Roman Emperors are marked *. When the year of coronation does not coincide with the year of the ascension to the royal throne, it is enclosed in parentheses.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c. — *Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS. EAST ROMAN.	EMPERORS. WEST ROMAN, AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
					1386. Baptism of Jagello, Grand Duke of Lithuania. Urban at Lucca.
					1387. Peter of Luxemburg †. Naples under Clement VII.
Boniface IX., Nov. 2, 1389, to Oct. 1, 1404.					1388. Urban again at Rome.
					1390. Ladislaus of Naples crowned at Gaeta.
Benedict XIII. (Peter de Luna), Sept. 28, 1394, deposed 1409 and 1417, † Nov., 1423.	Manuel II. Palæologus, 1391–1425.				1394. The University of Paris proposes three modes of restoring peace.
					1395. Meeting of the French clergy at Paris. Negotiations with other courts.
					1396. English synods against Wycliffe.
			Lancaster.		1398. King Wenceslaus negotiates with France at Rheims. France renounces obedience to the Pope of Avignon. Benedict besieged in his own palace.
		*Rupert of the Palatinate, 1400–1410.	Henry IV., 1399–1413.		1399. Reaction in favor of Benedict. Richard II. of England dethroned.
					1403. France returns to the obedience of Benedict. Boniface IX. recognizes Rupert King of the Germans.
					1405. Benedict in Italy.
Gregory XII., Dec. 1406, resigned 1415, † 1417.					1406. An assembly at Paris proposes an œcumenical council.
					1407. The projected conference between the two Popes does not come off. Gregory XII. at Siena.
					1408. Huss and his adherents join the Wycliffites. Benedict in Aragon. The cardinals renounce obedience. National synod at Paris.
Alexander V., June 26, 1409, to May 3, 1410.					1409. Council of Pisa. Increase of the schism, — three Popes instead of two.
John XXIII., 1410–1415 (both elected at Pisa).		Sigismund, 1410 (1433)–1437.			1410. Huss excommunicated. King Rupert †.
					1412. Roman Council. Contest and peace between John XXIII. and Ladislaus of Naples. Religious conference between Christians and Jews under Benedict XIII.
			Henry V., 1413–1422.		1413. Synod at Prague. Ladislaus invades the States of the Church. John flees to Florence. Convocation of the Council of Constance.
					1414. Beginning of the council. Huss arrives at Constance on Nov. 3. Ladislaus †.

Digitized by Google

					1415. Huss is burnt at the stake. Flight of Cossa. Benedict at Perpignan.
					1416. Jerome of Prague shares the fate of Huss.
Martin V., Nov. 11, 1417, to Feb. 20, 1431.					1417. Cardinal Zabarella †. Theodoric of Niem †. De Luna deposed. Lord Cobham beheaded.
					1418. Concordats with several nations.
					1419. St. Vincent Ferrer †. Disturbances in Bohemia. Martin V. in Florence. King Wenceslaus †.
					1420. Martin V. at Rome. Hussite wars.
			Henry VI., 1422–1461.	Charles VII., 1422–1461.	1423. Council of Pavia and Siena.
	John VII. Palæologus, 1425–1448.				1424. John Zisca †. The Hussites split into Calixtines and Taborites.
					1429. John Gerson †.
Eugene IV., March 3, 1431, to Feb. 23, 1447.					1431. Joan of Arc burnt. First session of the Council of Basle on Dec. 14. Bull of dissolution on Dec. 18.
					1432. Hostilities of the Basilians against the Pope.
					1433. Eugene IV. does his utmost to effect peace. Lidwina of Schiedam †.
					1434. Defeat of the Taborites.
					1435. Paul of Burgos†. Contest of the Basilians against Eugene.
					1436. Their manifesto. Eugene's memorial.
					1437. Proceedings against the Pope at Basle. Anarchy in Bohemia. The Greeks leave for Italy.
		*Albert II., 1438–1439.			1438. Second Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges. Negotiations with the Greeks commenced at Ferrara.
Felix V. (Amadeus of Savoy — last anti-Pope), Nov., 1439, to April, 1449.		Frederic III., 1440 (1452)–1493.			1439. Continued at Florence. Union with the Greeks and Armenians. The Germans at Mentz declare in favor of the Basilian decrees.
					1441. Diets at Mentz and Frankfort.
					1442. Union with the Jacobites. Frederic II. at Basle. Amadeus at Lausanne.
					1443. Eugene IV. again at Rome.
					1444. Defeat of the Christians at Varna. Cardinal Cesarini †. Cardinal Carvajal in Bohemia.
					1445. Diet at Frankfort.
					1446. Negotiations of the Germans with Rome.
Nicholas V., March 8, 1447, to March 24, 1455.	Constantine XII. (last Greek emperor), 1448–1453.				1447. Concordats of princes.
					1448. Concordat of Vienne.
					1449. Termination of the schism at Basle.
					1453. Capture of Constantinople by the Turks.
Calixtus III. (Borgia), 1455, to Aug., 1458.					1455. Alphonsus Tostatus †. L. Justiniani †.
					1456. John Capistranus †. Battle near Belgrade on July 22. Lorenzo Valla † 1457.
Pius II. (Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini), Aug., 1458, to Aug., 1464.					1459. Congress of Mantua. St. Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence †.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c. — *Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	EMPERORS.		ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	EAST ROMAN.	WEST ROMAN, AND GERMAN KINGS.			
			York.		
			Edward IV., 1461–1483.	Louis XI., 1461–1483.	1461. End of the Empire of Trebizond.
Paul II. (Peter Baroo), Aug. 30, 1464, to 1471.					1464. Nicholas of Cusa †.
					1468. Proceedings against the Abbreviators and the Academy of Sciences.
Sixtus IV. (Francis de la Rovere), 1471–1484.					1472. Cardinal Bessarion †. Fleet against the Turks.
					1474. St. Catharine of Genoa †.
					1475. John Goch †.
					1478. Conspiracy of the Pazzi at Florence.
					1480. Otranto taken by the Turks. The Florentines obtain pardon.
					1481. John Wesel at Mentz †.
			Edward V., 1483. Richard III., 1483–1485.	Charles VIII., 1483–1498.	1483. Conflict of the Pope with Venice. Birth of Martin Luther.
Innocent VIII. (J. B. of Cibo), 1484 to July 24, 1492.					1484. Lorenzo Colonna beheaded. Birth of Zwingli.
					1485. Rudolph Agricola †.
			Tudor. Henry VII., 1485–1509.		1486. Peace of the Pope with Naples, with the families of Colonna and Orsini.
					1487. Nicholas of Flue †.
					1489. John Wessel †.
Alexander VI. R. L. Borgia), Aug. 11, 1492, to Aug. 12, 1503.					1492. Discovery of America. Granada taken.
		Maximilian I., 1493–1519.			1493. Bull for Spain and Portugal.
					1494. John Pico of Mirandola †. Angelus Politianus †.
					1495. Gabriel Biel †.
				Louis XII., 1498–1515.	1498. Third Voyage of Columbus. The Spanish Moors are ordered to emigrate. Execution of Savonarola.
					1499. Marsilius Ficinus †.
					1500. Columbus brought to Spain as a prisoner.
Pius III. (Francis Piccolomini), 1503 (26 days).					1501. Censure of books. Severity against the Moors in Spain.
Julius III. (Julian d. la Rovere), 1503–1513.					1505. Zwingli ordained priest.
					1506. Christopher Columbus †.
					1507. St. Francis of Paula †. Luther becomes a priest.

Digitized by Google

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	WEST ROMAN EMPERORS AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	RULERS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
				Scotland: James IV., † 1514.	1508. **The title of "Electus Romanorum imperator" recognized.**
		Henry VIII., 1509–1547.		James V., 1514–1542.	1509. Erasmus in England. Birth of Calvin. Julius joins the League of Cambray.
					1510. Geiler of Kaisersberg †. Cardinal d'Amboise †
				Portugal: John III., 1521–1557.	1511. Establishment of the first American bishoprics. Beginning of the Conciliabulum of Pisa.
					1512. Eighteenth Œcumenical Council (Lat. V.) opened.
Leo X. (John de' Medici), March, 1513, to Dec. 1, 1521.				Poland: Sigismund I., 1501–1548.	1513. Continuation of the Lateran Council until 1517.
			Francis I., 1515–1547.		1516. Concordat with France. Epistolae obscurorum virorum.
				Sweden: Gustavus Vasa, 1523–1560.	1517. Cardinal Ximenes †. Luther's theses.
	Charles V., 1519 (1530)–1556.				1519. Disputation at Leipsic. Miltitz with Luther. P. Tetzel †. Discovery of Mexico by Cortez.
				Denmark: Christian II., 1513–1523.	1520. Bull of excommunication against Luther. He burns the bull and the Canon Law. Zwingli declares against celibacy.
				Frederic, 1523–1533.	1521. Diet at Worms. Sebastian Brant †. Innovations at Wittenberg. Luther condemned by the Parisian theologians.
Hadrian VI. (Utrecht), 1522, to Sept. 14, 1523.					**1522.** John Reuchlin †. Luther returns from the Wartburg to Wittenberg, expels Carlstadt, and enters into polemics with Henry VIII. Diet at Nürnberg.
Clement VII. (Julius de' Medici), Nov. 19, 1523, to Sept. 25, 1534.					**1523.** Thomas Münzer at Allstädt, Bucer and Capito at Strasburg. Luther's postil for preachers. Religious conference at Zürich. Francis of Sickingen †.
					1524. Campeggio at the Diet of Nürnberg. Several insurrections of peasants. Erasmus contra Luther. Zwingli's doctrine predominant at Zürich.
					1525. The peasants' war. Luther's marriage. John the Constant succeeds Frederic the Wise of Saxony. Albert of Brandenburg adopts Lutheranism.
					1526. Petrus Pomponatius †. Alliance of Torgau. Diet at Spire. Disputation of Baden. Louis, King of Hungary and Bohemia, defeated by Sultan Soliman †. Rome attacked by the Imperialists.
					1527. Terrible sacking of Rome by the troops of Charles V. Execution of bishops in Sweden. Diets at Westeräs and Odensee.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c.—*Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	WEST ROMAN EMPERORS AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	RULERS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
					1528. The Order of Capuchins confirmed by Clement VII. Parochial visitation in Saxony. Berthold Haller preaches Zwingli's teachings at Berne. Alliance of the Zwinglian cantons. J. Wimpfeling †.
					1529. The Protestants at the Diet of Spire. Peace of Barcelona and Cambray. Luther's Catechisms. Religious conference at Marburg. Synod of Orebro in Sweden.
					1530. Diet of Augsburg. Augsburg Confession. F. Lambert of Avignon †. Macchiavelli †. Predominance of Lutherans in Denmark.
					1531. Zwingli †. League of Schmalkald.
					1532. First religious peace at Nürnberg. John Frederic, Elector of Saxony. Confirmation of the Order of Barnabites. Lutheranism in Pomerania.
				Denmark: Christian III., 1533–1559.	1533. Negotiations between Pope and Emperor at Bologna. Cranmer declares the marriage of Henry VIII. with Catherine invalid.
Paul III. (A. Farnese), Oct. 13, 1534, to Nov. 10, 1549.					1534. Lutheranism in Würtemberg and Anhalt. Rome's decision declaring the marriage of Henry VIII. valid. France negotiates with Melanchthon.
					1535. League of Schmalkald renewed for ten years. Joachim I. of Brandenburg †. Oath of supremacy in England. Bishop Fisher and Thomas More executed. The reign of the Anabaptists at Münster closed.
					1536. Concordia of Wittenberg. Erasmus †. Calvin at Geneva. Consultation between Pope and Emperor. Convocation of an œcumenical council to convene at Mantua in 1537. All the Danish bishops imprisoned.
					1537. Articles of Schmalkald. Adjournment of the council. J. Bugenhagen crowns the Danish King and "reforms" the country. Paul III. defends the freedom and human dignity of the Indians. Mexico becomes a metropolis.
					1538. Armistice between Charles V. and Francis I. by papal mediation. Holy League of Nürnberg. Calvin driven from Geneva.

Digitized by Google

					1539. The council adjourns again. Duke George of Saxony †. His brother Henry and Joachim II. of Brandenburg introduce Lutheranism. Henry VIII. of England has six Religious Articles drawn up.
					1540. Confirmation of the Society of Jesus. Religious conferences at Spire, Hagenau, and Worms. Bigamy of Philip of Hesse. Thomas Cromwell executed.
					1541. Interim of Ratisbon. Unfortunate expedition of Charles V. in Africa. Calvin's return to Geneva.
				Scotland: Mary Stuart, under a protectorate, 1542–1560.	1542. Luther "consecrates" N. Amsdorf bishop. Brunswick Lutheranized by force. The Sacro Uffizio organized at Rome. St. Francis Xavier leaves for India. Ecclesiastical organization at Geneva.
					1543. J. Eck †. J. Clitoveus †.
					1544. Diet at Spire. Peace of Crespy. The University of Königsberg founded for Prussia.
					1545. Diet at Worms. Opening of the Council of Trent. Acts of severity against the sectarians in southern France.
					1546. Second colloquy at Ratisbon. M Luther †. Commencement of the Schmalkaldic War. Herman of Wied removed from the archiepiscopal see of Cologne. Francis Victoria, O. Pr. †.
		Edward VI., 1547–1553.	**Henry II., 1547–1559.**		1547. The Council of Trent transferred to Bologna. Victory of Charles V. near Mühlberg. Diet of Augsburg. Knox in Scotland. St. Cajetan of Thiene †. Bembo†. Sadolet†. Beatus Rhenanus †. St. Domingo made a metropolis.
				Poland. Sigismund II., 1548–1572.	1548. Interim of Augsburg and Leipsic. Lima erected into a metropolis.
Julius III. (J. del Monte), Feb., 1550, to April, 1555.					1549. Paul Fagius in England †. Suspension of the Council at Bologna. Francis Xavier in Japan.
					1550. John of God. †. Duke Ulric of Würtemberg †.
					1551. Return of the Council to Trent. M. Bucer in England †. Bishopric Bahia in Brazil.
					1552. Treason of Maurice of Saxony against the Emperor. Treaty of Passau. Francis Xavier †. The Forty-two Articles of the Church of England. Andrew Osiander †.
		Mary the Catholic. 1553–1558.			1553. M. Servede burnt at Geneva. Maurice of Saxony †.
					1554. Assembly at Naumburg. Cardinal Pole in England endeavors to remove the schism. Ambr. Catharinus, O. Pr. †.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c.— *Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	WEST ROMAN EMPERORS AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	RULERS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Marcellus II. (Cervinus), 21 days, † April, 1555.					1555. Religious Peace of Augsburg. St. Thomas of Villa Nuova †. First Council of Mexico.
Paul IV. (Caraffa), May 23, 1555, to Aug. 18, 1559.	Ferdinand I., 1556–1564.			Spain: Philip II., 1556–1598.	1556. Thomas Cranmer burnt at the stake. St. Ignatius of Loyola †. Conflict of the Pope with Spain. Religious liberty ordained in Transylvania.
				Portugal: Sebastian, 1557–1578.	1557. Religious conference at Worms. Goa, metropolis in East India.
		Elizabeth, 1558–1603.		Cardinal Henry, 1578–1580.	1558. Calvin's Academy at Geneva. Cardinal Pole †. University of Jena founded.
Pius IV. (J. A. de' Medici), Dec. 26, 1559, to Dec. 9, 1565.			Francis II., 1559–1560.		1559. Confirmation of the Religious Peace of Augsburg. In England restoration of the status quo under Edward VI. Parker consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. Rebellion in Scotland under Knox. Calvinist Synod at Paris. Increase of the bishoprics in the Netherlands.
			Charles IX., 1560–1574.	Scotland: Mary Stuart, 1560–1568.	1560. Melanchthon †. Melchior Canus †. Robert Cenalis †. New convocation of the Tridentine Council. Suppression of the Catholic religion in Scotland. Conspiracy of Amboise.
					1561. Papal legates at Naumburg. Colloquy of Poissy. Courland secularized and Lutheranized. Simon Mennonis †. Schwenkfeld †.
					1562. Seventeenth to twenty-second session of the Tridentine Council. Toleration edict and first religious war in France. Confessio Belgica. Oath of supremacy made obligatory in England. The Thirty-nine Articles ratified at London. Lælius Socinus †.
					1563. The Cardinals of Mantua and Seripando ††. Twenty-third to twenty-fifth session at Trent. A Hungarian synod declares in favor of Beza. Unitarian communities in Poland and Transylvania. Acts of Uniformity. Duke of Guise murdered. Treaty of Amboise.
	Maximilian II., 1564–1576.				1564. S. Fé de Bogota made into a metropolis. Bull confirming the Council of Trent. Cassander's project of union. John Calvin †.

Digitized by Google

				1565. Second Prov. Synod of Mexico. Polish Synod at Petrikau. J. Lainez, S. J.†. W. Farrel, N. Amsdorf, Vergerius † †.
St. Pius V. (M. Ghislerio), Jan. 8, 1566, to May 1, 1572.				1566. Catechismus Rom. ad parochos. B. Las Casas †. L. Blosius †. Compromise of the nobility in the Netherlands, and iconoclasm. Corpus doctrinae Prutenicum. Confessio Helvetica posterior. J. Agricola †. G. Cassander †.
				1567. Bull against Baius. Duke Alva in the Netherlands. Bloody scenes at Nîmes. Second religious war in France.
			Scotland: James VI., 1568–1578 under a protectorate; from 1578–1625, alone.	1568. Revision of the Roman Breviary. English seminary at Douay. Mary Stuart flees to Elizabeth. Suppression of Catholicism in Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel. Eric XIV., of Sweden, dethroned as a Calvinist. Albert of Prussia †.
				1569. Third religious war in France.
			Sweden: John III., 1568–1592.	1570. Synod of the Polish Dissidents at Sandomir, and of the Hungarian Calvinists at Czenger. Bull of excommunication against Elizabeth. Revision of the Missal.
				1571. Battle near Lepanto. Edicts of persecution against the Catholics in England.
Gregory XIII., 1572 to April, 1585.				1572. St. Bartholomew's Day. John Knox †. St. Francis Borgia †.
				1573. Religious Peace of Warsaw. Fourth religious war in France.
				1574. G. Wizel †. F. Stancarus †. G. Major †. Action taken against Crypto-Calvinism in the Electorate of Saxony.
		Henry III., 1575–1589.	Poland: Stephen Bathory, 1575–1586.	1575. Bullinger at Zürich †. Flacius at Frankfort †. Confessio Bohemica.
	Rudolph II., 1576–1612.			1576. Religious Peace of Beaulieu. The Catholic League. Corpus doctrinae Julium. Commencement of the negotiations of the Protestant theologians of Würtemberg with Jeremias, Patriarch of Constantinople.
				1577. Possevin sent to Sweden. Assembly at Blois. Fifth religious war. Formula of Concord.
				1578. Discovery of the Cœmeterium S. Priscillae at Rome. D. Juan of Austria †.
				1579. New bull against Baius. Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius †. English seminary at Rome. Republic of Holland. Union of Utrecht.
				1580. Sixth religious war in France. Synod of Rakow. Saxon Book of Concord.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c.—*Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	WEST ROMAN EMPERORS AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	RULERS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
				Portugal: Philip II., of Spain, 1580–1598.	1581. Decrees of persecution against the Catholics in England and Holland. M. Medina †. L. Bertrand †.
					1582. Reform of the Calendar. Provincial Synod of Lima. St. Theresa †.
					1583. Third Council of Mexico. Vicariates-apostolic for Holland. Maldonat †. Gebhard, Archbishop of Cologne, excommunicated.
					1584. St. Charles Borromeo †. Francis Commendone †. William of Orange murdered.
Sixtus V. (Peretti), April, 1585, to Aug. 27, 1590.					1585. Alphonsus Salmeron †.
					1586. M. Chemnitz †.
				Poland: Sigismund III., 1587–1632.	1587. Execution of Mary Stuart. Persecution of Christians in Japan. New Roman edition of the Septuagint. Alliance of the Catholics of Switzerland with Spain. Pamelius †. J. Wigand †.
				Denmark: Christian IV., 1588–1648.	1588. The Spanish Armada ceases to exist. Assassination of the Guises at Blois. Establishment of the patriarchate of Moscow. W. Lindanus †. V. Weigel †.
			Bourbon. Henry IV., 1589–1610.		1589. Papal monitoriums for France. Henry III. assassinated. M. Baius †.
Urban VII. (Castanea), 1590.					1590. Bartholomew de Martyribus †. Cardinal of Bourbon (Charles X.) † May 8. Persecution of Christians in Japan.
Gregory XIV. (Sfondrato), Dec. 5, 1590–1592.					1591. John of the Cross †. A. Gonzaga †. Defeat of the Saxon Crypto-Calvinists.
Innocent IX. (Facchinetto), 2 months.				Sweden: Sigismund III. (K. of Poland, 1587–1632), 1592–1600.	1592. New edition of the Vulgate, thoroughly revised. Victory of Presbyterianism in Scotland.
Clement VIII. (Aldobrandini), Jan. 20, 1592, to March 5, 1605.					1593. Cornelius Loos †. Assembly of the States at Upsala.
					1594. Council and Union of Brest. W. Allen †. Palestrina †. O. Lasso †.
					1595. Henry IV. absolved by the Pope. Manila a metropolis. St. Philip Neri †. Torquato Tasso †.
					1596. Persecution of Christians in Japan. Bishopric of Angola.
					1597. Confirmation of the Fathers of the Christian Doctrine. Death of the Jesuits P. Canisius, J. Anchieta, and J. Wujek.

Digitized by Google

				Spain: Philip III., 1598–1621.	1598. Papal mediation of peace between Spain and France. Edict of Nantes. Th. Stapleton †. Sessions of the Congreg. de Auxiliis gratiae.
					1600. Celebration of the Great Jubilee. Papal mediation of peace between France and Savoy.
					1601. Religious conference at Ratisbon. The Osiandrist Funk beheaded.
		Stuart. James I., 1603–1625.			1604. Gabriel Vasquez †. Faustus Socinus †. Controversy between Arminius and Gomar at Leyden.
Leo XI. (Medici), 1605, 26 days. Paul V. (Borghese), May 16, 1605, to Jan. 18, 1621.					1605. Th. Beza †. Gunpowder Plot at London.
					1606. Conflict of the Pope with Venice. P. Valignano, S. J. †.
					1607. Reconciliation of the Pope with Venice. Termination of the negotiations of the Congreg. de Auxiliis. Magdalene de Pazzis †. C. Baronius †.
					1608. La Plata in Bolivia a metropolis. Protestant Union.
					1609. Catholic League. Arminius †.
			Louis XIII., 1610–1643.		1610. St. Francis Solanus †. M. Ricci, S. J. †. Henry IV. murdered, May 4.
					1611. Anthony Possevin †. Reductions of the Jesuits in Paraguay. Conflicts in Bohemia.
	Matthias, 1612–1619.				1612. New persecution of Christians in Japan.
					1613. Diet at Ratisbon. W. Estius †.
					1614. Camillus of Lellis †. J. Sigismund of Brandenburg Calvinist. Confessio Marchica.
					1615. Aquaviva, fifth General of the Jesuits †.
					1617. St. Rosa of Lima †. Suarez †. Alphonsus Rodriguez †.
					1618. Cardinal du Perron †. Congregation of St. Maur. Peace between Poland and Russia. Insurrection in Bohemia. Beginning of the Thirty Years' War. Synod of Dordrecht.
	Ferdinand II., 1619–1637.				1619. Frederic V. of the Palatinate crowned king at Prague. Persecution of the Arminians in Holland.
					1620. Victory of the imperial armies near Prague.
Gregory XV. (Ludovisi), Feb. 9, 1621, to 1623. Urban VIII. (Barberini), 1623–1644.				Spain: Philip IV., 1621–1665.	1621. John Berchmans †. Bellarmin †. Petrus Arcadius †. J. Arndt †. Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople.
					1622. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide. St. Fidelis of Sigmaringen †. St. Francis of Sales †.
					1624. Mariana †. J. Böhme †.
		Charles I., 1625–1649.			1625. Cameron †. Maurice of Orange †.
					1626. Tilly's victories over the Danes. Bacon of Verulam †. Paredes of Quito †.
					1627. Collegium Urbanum founded. Sedition of the French Calvinists.
					1628. La Rochelle taken from the Huguenots. Their defeat. Malvenda †.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c.—*Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	WEST ROMAN EMPERORS AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	RULERS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
					1629. Peter de Berulle †. Edict of Nîmes. Restitution Edict by Ferdinand II.
					1630. Gustavus Adolphus comes to Germany.
					1631. Capture of Magdeburg. Conference at Leipsic.
				Poland: Ladislaus IV., 1632–1648.	1632. Tilly †. Gustavus Adolphus †. A. Tanner, S. J. †. Lord Baltimore in Maryland.
					1633. Investigations regarding Galileo at Rome.
					1634. Wallenstein murdered. Victory of the Imperialists near Nördlingen.
					1635. P. Laymann, S. J. †. Didarus Alvarez †. Lopez de Vega †.
	Ferdinand III., 1637–1657.				1637. Corn. a Lapide †. Bzovius †. Suppression of Christianity in Japan.
					1638. New success of the Swedes. Du Puy for the Gallican Liberties. C. Jansenius †. Cyril Lucaris strangled.
					1639. A. Bosio †.
				Portugal: John IV., of Braganza, 1640–1656.	1640. Long Parliament in England. Hyacintha de Mariscottis †.
					1641. Preliminaries of peace. Conflict between Rome and Spain. St. Jane Frances of Chantal †. Spondanus †.
					1642. Synod of Jassy. Irish National Assembly for religious war. Cardinal Richelieu †.
			Louis XIV., 1643–1715.		1643. Intolerance in Virginia. St. Cyran †. Bonfrère, S. J. †. Revision of the breviary.
Innocent X. (Pamfili), September, 1644, to Jan. 5, 1655.					1644. W. Chillingworth †.
					1645. Polyglot of Paris. Hugo Grotius †. Conference at Thorn. Charles I. delivered up to the Parliament. Abolition of the Episcopal Church.
					1646. J. Eliot in N. America.
					1647. Presbyterian confession of Scotland. G. Fox, founder of the Quakers.
				Poland: J. Casimir, 1648–1668. † 1672.	1648. Peace of Westphalia. Jos. Calasanza †. Herbert of Cherbury †.
		Republic, 1649–1660.			1649. Papal action against the Duke of Parma. Charles I. of England executed. English Commonwealth.
					1650. Cartesius †.
					1652. Petavius †. Sandoval †.

Digitized by Google

					1653. Papal condemnation of five propositions of Jansenius. Oliver Cromwell, Protector of England.
				Sweden: Charles X., 1654–1660.	1654. Conversion of Queen Christina of Sweden. P. Claver, S. J. † V. Andreæ †.
Alexander VII. (Chigi), 1655–1667.					1655. Arnauld's letters on "Fait et Droit." "Consensus repetitae fidei vere Lutheranae" in the electorate of Saxony. Joshua de la Place †.
	Leopold I., 1657–1705.			Portugal: Alphonsus VI., 1656–1667, † 1683.	1656. Confirmation of the bulls against Jansenius. R. Nobili, S. J. †. G. Calixtus †. J. Hales †.
					1658. The Socinians driven from Poland.
					1659. Protector Cromwell succeeded by his son Richard Robert. J. Morinus †. Lazarists appointed as apostolic vicars for China.
		Charles II., 1660–1685.		Sweden: Charles XI., 1660–1672, under guardian.	1660. St. Vincent of Paul †. Cardinal de Lugo †.
					1661. B. Walton †.
					1662. Petrus de Marca †. Pascal †. Trappists founded.
					1663. Interference of the Parliament at Paris in theology.
					1664. Joseph of Cupertino †. Amyrault †. Obstinacy of the nuns of Port Royal.
				Spain: Charles II., 1665–1700.	1665. J. Bolland, S. J. †. H. Holden †.
					1666. P. Schall, S. J. †. B. Carpzov †.
Clement IX. (Rospigliosi), June, 1667–1670.					1667. Vicariate apostolic for North Germany. Bossuet's "Exposition de la foi catholique."
				Portugal: Peter II., 1668–1706.	1668. Papal mediation of peace between Spain and France. Peace of Lisbon. J. Balde, S. J. †.
					1669. Papal decree on the Chinese Customs. Leo Allatius †.
Clement X. (Altieri), 1670–1676.				Poland: M. Th. Wisniowiecky, 1669–1673.	1670. Collegia pietatis of Spener. Gonzalez de Tellez †.
					1671. First edition of Quesnel's "Moral Reflections."
					1672. Synod of the Schismatics at Jerusalem.
				John Sobieski, 1674–1696.	1673. Test Acts of Charles II. of England. Beginning of the conflict on the Regalia in France.
					1675. Lightfoot †. Formula consensus Helvetici.
Innocent XI. (Odescalchi), Sept. 21, 1676, to Aug. 10, 1689.				Sweden: Charles XI., 1672–1697.	1676. P. Gerhard †.
					1677. Spinoza †. Angelus Silesius †.
					1678. Conspiracy of Oates. Papal admonitions to Louis XIV.
					1679. Thomas Hobbes †.
					1682. Declaratio Cleri Gallicani.
					1683. Vienne threatened by the Turks. Insurrection of the Calvinists in Dauphiné.
					1684. P. Quesnel expelled from the Oratory.
		James II., 1685–1688.			1685. Insurrection at Nîmes. Abolition of the Edict of Nantes.
					1686. Pearson †.
					1688. French appeal to an œcumenical council. Persecution in Siam. Spreading of the Baptists. Frederic William, Elector of Brandenburg †. F. Verbiest in China †.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c.—*Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	WEST ROMAN EMPERORS AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	RULERS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Alexander VIII. (Ottoboni), 1689–1691.		William III. and Mary II., 1689–1702.		Russia: Peter the Great, 1689–1725.	1689. Christina of Sweden †. Acts of Toleration with the exclusion of Catholics in England.
					1690. Papal decrees against the Gallican Liberties and extension of the Regalia. Expulsion of the Pietists from Leipsic. Bishoprics in China.
Innocent XII. (Pignatelli), 1691–1700.					1691. G. Fox †. R. Baxter †. M. Alacoque †.
					1692. Emperor Kanghi in China recalls the prohibitions of the Christian religion.
					1693. Retractions of the Declaration of 1682 in France. Negotiations of union carried on between Bossuet and Leibnitz. Decree of the apostolic vicar Maigrot on Chinese customs.
					1694. Papal decree against the Jansenists. Conference at Issy. University of Halle founded. A. Arnauld †.
					1695. B. Spinola †. Henry Basnage †.
					1696. J. Sobieski, King of Poland, †. M. Molinos †. Persecution in Tonquin. Spencer †.
				Sweden: Charles XII., 1697–1718.	1697. Peace of Ryswick. Augustus of Saxony becomes Catholic. P. Vieyra, S. J. †. Missions in California before and after this time.
				Poland: Augustus of Saxony, 1697–1733.	1698. Peace of Carlowitz. Tillemont †.
					1699. Roman condemnation of the teaching of Fénelon in his "Maximes des Saints."
Clement XI. (Albani), Nov. 23, 1700, to March 29, 1721.					1700. Jubilee at Rome. Prussia declared a kingdom. At the death of Charles II., Nov. 1, the Spanish War of the Succession begins. The Russian patriarchate ceases to exist on the death of Patriarch Hadrian.
				Prussia: Frederic I., 1701–1713.	1701. The "Case of Conscience" in France.
		Anne, 1702–1714.			1702. Philip of Bourbon at Naples. Conflict of the Pope with the Emperor.
				Spain: Philip V. of Bourbon, 1701–1746.	1704. Bossuet †. Cardinal Noris †. Bourdaloue †. Locke †. P. Kodde deposed as a Jansenist. Prohibition of the Malabar Customs by Tournon.
	Emperor. Joseph I., 1705–1711.				1705. Spener †.
				Portugal: John V., 1706–1750.	1706. Conflict between Rome and the Emperor regarding Parma. P. Bayle †.

Digitized by Google

					1707. Conflict between Rome and the Duke of Savoy. Tournon in prison. J. Mill †.
					1708. Brief against Quesnel's "Moral Reflections." Mabillon †. Bingham †.
					1709. Suppression of the convent of Port Royal. Abraham a St. Clara †. The Pope's conflict with Philip of Bourbon.
					1710. Tournon †. P. Kodde †.
	Charles VI., 1711–1740.				1711. Gerberon †. Dodwell †.
					1712. New persecution in Tonquin. R. Simon †. Grabe †.
				Prussia: Frederic William, 1713–1740.	1713. Peace of Utrecht. Duke of Savoy declared king. Bull "Unigenitus." W. Cave †. W. Lyons †. Shaftesbury †.
		Hanover. George I., 1714–1727.		Victor Amadeus II., K. of Sardinia, 1714–1730.	1714. Peace of Rastadt. French opposition against the Bull "Unigenitus."
			Louis XV., 1715–1774.		1715. Bull against the Monarchia Sicula. Oath regarding the Chinese customs. P. F. Lainez †. Fénelon †. Malebranche †. Burnet †.
					1716. Leibnitz †.
					1717. The Appellants in France. Concordat with Spain. Lodge of Freemasons at London. Johanna de la Mothe Guyon †.
				Sweden: U. Eleonora, 1718–1741.	1718. Excommunication of the Appellants. Sicily Spanish.
					1719. Quesnel †. R. Cumberland †. J. B. de la Salle †.
				Frederic I. (husband of Eleonora), 1720–1751.	1720. The Holy Synod established by Peter I.
Innocent XIII. (Conti), 1721–1724, † March 7.					1721. Toland †. D. Huet †.
Benedict XIII. (Orsini), May 29, 1724, to Feb. 21, 1730.					1723. Bull for Spain. Fleury †. J. Basnage †.
					1724. Natalis Alexander †.
					1725. The Pope's conflict with Portugal.
		George II., 1727–1760.		Russia: Catherine I., 1725–1727.	1727. Zinzendorf's ecclesiastical organization.
					1728. Constitution "Fideli" for Sicily. Chr. Thomasius †. Office of Gregory VII.
				Peter II., 1727–1730.	1729. F. Buddeus †. A. Collins †. S. Clarke †. Noailles of Paris †.
Clement XII. (Corsini), 1730–1740.				Sardinia: Charles Emmanuel III., 1730–1773.	1730. Methodist societies in England.
					1731. Th. Woolston †. The Lutherans emigrate from Salzburg.
					1732. The Congregation of Redemptorists founded. Whitefield joins the Methodists.
				Russia: Anne, 1730–1740.	1733. Wertheim Bible.
					1734. Tindal †.
				Poland: Augustus II., 1736–1763.	1735. Schmalzgrueber, S. J. †.
					1737. New martyrs in Tonquin. Concordat with Spain. Turretin †. Freemasons in Germany.
					1738. Bull against Freemasonry.

Digitized by Google

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c. — *Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	WEST ROMAN EMPERORS AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	RULERS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
Benedict XIV. (Lambertini), Aug. 17, 1740, to May 3, 1758.	Maria Theresa, 1740–1780. Charles VII., 1742–1745.			Russia: Elizabeth, 1740–1762. Prussia: Frederic II., 1740–1786.	1739. Peace at Belgrade. 1740. Norbert's agitations against the Jesuits. 1741. Agreements with Sardinia and Naples. Bernard of Montfaucon †. Alliance of the Herrnhuters. 1742. Guatemala a metropolis. Armenian patriarchate of Cilicia confirmed. Cardinal Gotti †. Prohibition of the Chinese customs. Persecutions in China and Thibet.
	Francis I., 1745–1765.			Spain: Ferdinand VI., 1746–1759. Portugal: Joseph Emmanuel, 1750–1777. Sweden: Adolph Frederic, 1751–1771.	1743. Thomas Morgan †. 1744. Prohibition of the Malabar customs. 1747. Thomas Chubb †. F. Hutcheson †. 1748. Privileges for Portugal. Rex fidelissimus. Decrease in the number of feast-days. 1749. Petrus Mechitar in Armenia †. 1750. Treaty between Spain and Portugal. L. A. Muratori †. S. Bach †. 1751. Two metropoles for Aquileia. Görz and Udine. Leonardo a Portu Mauritio †. J. Bolingbroke †. 1752. Bengel †. 1753. Concordat with Spain. Bull on mixed marriages. Berkeley †. 1754. Archbp. Beaumont of Paris banished. Baron Wolf †. The biblical critic Wetstein †.
Clement XIII. (Rezzonico), July 6, 1758, to February, 1769.		George III., 1760–1820.		Spain: Charles III., 1759–1788. Naples: Ferdinand IV., 1759–1767, under guardian; 1767–1825, alone. Russia: Peter III., murdered. Catherine II., 1762–1796.	1755. Earthquake at Lisbon. Montesquieu †. L. Mosheim †. 1757. Agreement with Maria Theresa regarding Milan. Calmet †. Baumgarten †. 1758. L. Ricci becomes General of the Jesuits. M. B. Solimani †. 1759. Persecution of the Jesuits in Portugal by Pombal. 1760. Portugal's rupture with Rome. Count Zinzendorf †. 1761. Cardinal Orsini †. The French Parliament against the Jesuits. 1762. Suppression of the Jesuits in France. Alphonsus Liguori, bishop. 1763. Pseudo-synod of the Jansenist Meindarts of Utrecht. Book of Febronius "de Statu Ecclesiae." Termination of the Seven Years' War.

Digitized by Google

	Joseph II., 176[illegible]–1790.			1764.	General German Library founded by Nicolai. J. B. de Rossi at Rome †.
				1765.	Bull confirming the Society of Jesus.
			Denmark: Christian VII., 1766–1808.	1766.	Capuchins and French priests in Congo and other African districts.
				1767.	Expulsion of the Jesuits from Spain, Naples, and Parma.
Clement XIV. (Ganganelli), May 19, 1769, to Sept. 22, 1774.				1768.	Papal monitorium against Parma. Alliance of the Bourbon against the Pope. Petrus Annet †. Reimarus †.
				1770.	Reconciliation between Rome and Portugal. G. Whitefield †. Polish confederation.
			Sweden: Gustavus III., 1771–1792.	1772.	Helvetius †. Martin of Cochem †. E. Swedenborg †. First division of Poland.
				1773.	Brief "Dominus ac Redemtor."
		Louis XVI., 1774-1792.	Sardinia: Victor Amadeus, 1773–1796.	1774.	Wolfenbüttel Fragments published by Lessing.
Pius VI. (Braschi), February, 1775, to Aug. 29, 1799.				1775.	War of Independence in North America. Shakers in America. L. Ricci †.
				1776.	Establishment of the North American Union on July 11. The Illuminati. D. Hume †. San Francisco in North America founded by Franciscans.
			Portugal: Mary, 1777–1816; Prince John rules in her stead from 1792.	1777.	Fall of Pombal.
				1778.	J. J. Rousseau †. Voltaire †.
				1779.	Submission of Isenbiehl. J. J. Gassner †.
				1780.	Reforms in Tuscany. Voit, S. J. †. Condillac †.
				1781.	Vicariate-apostolic in Cairo. Extension of the Placet in Austria. Reforms of Joseph II. Lessing †. Ernesti †.
				1782.	Pius VI. at Vienna. Cybel's libels. Oettinger †.
				1783.	The Jesuits continue to exist in Russia; archbishopric of Mohilev. P. Junipero Serra, O. S. F. †. The Illuminati prohibited in Bavaria. D'Alembert †.
				1784.	Diderot †.
				1785.	Nunciature at Munich.
			Prussia: Frederic William II., 1786–1797.	1786.	Congress of Ems. Synod of Pistoja. Moses Mendelssohn †.
				1787.	Assembly of French Notables. Edict for equality of the Protestants with the Catholics. Agitation against Bishop Ricci at Prato. Meeting of Tuscan bishops. Alphonsus of Liguori †. Venema †.
				1788.	Wöllner's edict regarding religion. The Notables of France.
			Spain: Charles IV., 1789–1808.	1789.	Papal reply to the Rhenish archbishops regarding the nunciatures. The Constituent National Assembly of France declares that all ecclesiastical possessions are national property.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF POPES, EMPERORS, KINGS, &c.—*Continued.*

POPES; PAPAL DATES.	WEST ROMAN EMPERORS AND GERMAN KINGS.	ENGLISH KINGS.	FRENCH KINGS.	RULERS IN OTHER COUNTRIES.	IMPORTANT EVENTS.
	Leopold II., 1790–1792.				1790. Suppression of the convents, and civil constitution for the clergy. John Nicholas of Hontheim †. Adam Smith †. The first North American bishop, Carroll, consecrated at London.
					1791. Persecution in France of the priests who do not take the civil oath. Mirabeau †. Flight and imprisonment of the king. Convocation of the Legislative Assembly. First diocesan synod in the U. S. John Wesley †. Semler †. Michaelis †. Mozart †.
	Francis II., 1792 to the Dissolution of the German Empire in 1806.		First Republic, 1792–1804. Convention, 1792–1795. Directory, 1795–1799. Consulate, 1799–1804.		1792. Closing of most of the churches in France. Deportation of priests. Declaration of the French Republic at the opening of the National Convention. Spangenberg †. Bahrdt †.
					1793. Execution of Louis XVI., Jan. 21; of the Queen, Oct. 16; of the Duke of Orleans, Nov. 6. Worship in honor of the Goddess of Reason. Marat †. Second division of Poland.
					1794. Danton executed, April 5. Robespierre decrees the existence of a Supreme Being, July 3; is executed, July 27. Bull "Auctorem fidei."
					1795. Directory at Paris. Peace between Prussia and France at Basle. Third division of Poland. Great missionary society at London.
				Russia: Paul I., 1796–1801.	1796–1800. Rising of Bonaparte. First consul. Rome proclaimed a republic (1798). Irish insurrection. Pius VI. dies at Valence, Aug. 29, 1799.
Pius VII. (Chiaramonti), 1800–1823, †Aug. 20.				Sardinia: Charles Emmanuel, 1796–1802.	1800. Papal election at Venice, March 14. Journey of the Pope to Rome. Consalvi, secretary of state. Victory of Marengo. Malta taken by the English. Frederic Leopold of Stolberg becomes a Catholic.
				Prussia: Frederic William III., 1797–1840.	1801. Peace of Lunéville, Feb. 9. Consalvi concludes the Concordat at Paris. Lavater †. Formal restoration of the Jesuits in Russia.
				Russia: Alexander I., 1801–1825.	1802. Peace of Amiens between France and England. Concordat published, and the Organic Articles. Restoration of worship. Dalberg, Elector of Mentz, receives the see of Ratisbon. Secularization in Germany.

Digitized by Google

		Emperor. Napoleon I, 1804–1814.		1803. Klopstock †. Herder †. Italian Concordat. 1804–1806. Pius VII. anoints Bonaparte Emperor. British and Foreign Missionary Society. Kant †. The Pope's return to Rome (1805). Peace of Presburg. Fr. Schiller †. 1806. Dissolution of the German Empire. Confederation of the Rhine.

Note. — The Chronological Table ends here, as its continuation to the present day would occupy too much space, on account of the numerous events that have happened in our century. Besides, these events are better known than those preceding.

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

GENERAL INDEX.

ABASGI, i. 118.
Abbacomites, i. 268.
Abdas, Bp. of Susa, i. 118.
Abelard, ii. 77 sq.
Abgar, i. 38.
Abgar, image, i. 210.
Aboe, i. 318.
Abraham a St. Clara, ii. 260.
Abraxas, i. 92.
Absalon, Bp. of Roskild, i. 318.
Abyssinia, i. 119.
Acacius, Bp. of Amida, i. 118; of Berœa, i. 180; of Cæsarea, i. 165, 169; of Constantinople, i. 184.
Academy of Sciences, ii. 41.
Acceptants, ii. 282.
Acephali, i. 185.
Achamoth, i. 92.
Achillas of Alexandria, i. 162.
Achterfeld, ii. 409.
Acre (Ptolemais), i. 313.
Acta Pilati, i. 60; Sanctorum, ii. 259.
Adalbert, Archbp. of Bremen, i. 242; of Mentz, i. 332; Bp. of Prague, i. 244, 319; heretic, i. 236; son of Berengarius, i. 260.
Adam of Bremen, i. 291.
Adamites, ii. 115.
Adelphius, i. 212.
Adeodatus, i. 148.
Adoptionism, i. 299 sqq.
Advent, i. 209.
Advocati togati et armati, i. 270.
Ædesius, i. 119.
Ægidius, of Rome, ii. 82; of Viterbo, ii. 134.
Ælfried, i. 290.
Ælia Capitolina, i. 48.
Æluros, Timotheus, i. 184.
Æneas Sylvius, ii. 39, 41.
Æons, i. 90.
Aërius of Sebaste, i. 212.
Aëtius, i. 167.
Afra, St., i. 51.
Africa, Christianity in, i. 34; ii. 140, 330.
Agapæ, i. 108.
Agapetus, i. 146, 186; ii. 260.
Agatho, i. 148, 193 sqq.
Agenda, ii. 415.
Agilulph, i. 223.
Agnoetai, i. 186.
Agobard of Lyons, i. 288, 294; ii. 102.
Agricola, John, ii. 265; Rudolph, ii. 92.
Agrippa, Herod, i. 40.
Agrippinus, Bp. of Carthage, i. 105.
Aidan, i. 229.
Aistulf, i. 251.
Akiba, i. 48.
Alanus of Ryssel, ii. 79.
Alaric, i. 219.
Alberic of Tuscany, i. 260.
Albert, of Apeldern, i. 319; of Brandenburg, ii. 163, 265; Emperor, ii. 38; Magnus, ii. 80; of Mentz, ii. 153, 164.
Albigenses, ii. 99 sqq.
Albinus, i. 230.
Albion, i. 237.
Alboin, i. 222.
Albornoz, ii. 22.
Alcantara, Peter of, ii. 232.
Alcuin, i. 287, 300.
Aleander, ii. 159, 232.
Alemany, ii. 319.
Alexander (I.), i. 78; (II.), Pope, i. 267, 281; (III.), i. 338, 343 sqq.; (IV.), i. 354; (V.), ii. 28; (VI.), ii. 43 sqq., 141; (VII.), ii. 244; (VIII.), ii. 247.
Alexander, of Alexandria, i. 162; of Hales, ii. 79; of Jerusalem, i. 86; Severus, i. 57.
Alexandria, Patriarchate, i. 137; School, i. 85; Synod, i. 112, 162.
Alexians, ii. 63.
Alfred the Great, i. 290.
Algiers, ii. 330.
Allegri, ii. 309.
Allen, William, ii. 200.
Alliance, Evangelical, ii. 416, 422.
Allies, T. W., ii. 397.
All-Saints, Feast, i. 209, 307.
All-Souls, Feast, i. 307.
Alogi, i. 98.
Alombrados, ii. 284.
Alonzo, ii. 372.
Alphonsus of Castile, i. 355.
Alphonsus XII. of Spain, ii. 373.
Altar, i. 205.
Altham, ii. 149.
Alva, Duke, ii. 198.
Alvarez, ii. 278.
Alvarus, i. 321.
Alvarus Pelagius, ii. 18.
Alzog, i. 23.
Amadeus of Savoy (Felix V.), ii. 38; Duke, ii. 247.
Amalarius of Metz, i. 303, 306.
Amaleric of Chartres (Bena), ii. 99.
Amandus of Mästricht, i. 233.
Amboise, conspiracy, ii. 183.
Ambon, i. 205.
Ambrose, St., i. 156, 206, 214.
Ambrosiaster, i. 156.
America, ii. 141 sq., 312 sq.
Amict, i. 207.
Ammonius, i. 213; Saccas, i. 64.
Amolo of Lyons, i. 302.
Amort, ii. 87.
Amphilochius, Bp. of Iconium, i. 170.
Amsdorf, ii. 265 sq.
Anabaptists, ii. 177, 269.
Anastasius, Pope (I.), i. 148; (II.), i. 145; (IV.), i. 325.
Anastasius, of Constantinople, i. 292; Emperor (I.), 185; historian, i. 21.
Anathema, i. 204.
Anchieta, ii. 144.
Anchorano, Peter, ii. 28.
Anchorets, i. 213.
Ancyra, Synod of, i. 134.

Digitized by Google

Anderson, Lorenzo, ii. 213.
Andlaw, ii. 352.
Andreæ, James, ii. 267; John Valentine, ii. 270.
Andrew, of Samosata, i. 179; King of Hungary, i. 314; of Rhodes, ii. 94.
Andronicus (II. and III.), ii. 94.
Angela, of Foligny, ii. 129; Merici (Brescia), ii. 239.
Angelica Arnauld (of Port Royal), ii. 280.
Angelus Domini, ii. 125.
Anglican Church, ii. 194 sq.; ordinations, ii. 201.
Anglo-Catholics, ii. 395 sq.
Anglo-Saxons, i. 227 sq.
Anicet, Pope, i. 78.
Annates, ii. 36, 51.
Anomœans, i. 166.
Ansegisus, i. 289.
Anselm, of Canterbury, i. 291, 340, ii. 76 sq.; of Havelberg, ii. 93; of Laon, ii. 88.
Ansgar, St., i. 239 sq.
Anthimus of Constantinople, i. 141.
Anthonists, ii. 63.
Anthony, hermit, i. 164, 213; Iconoclast, i. 293; of Padua, ii. 69.
Anthropomorphites, i. 188.
Antidikomarianites, i. 208.
Ἀντίδωρα, i. 108.
Antinomian contest, ii. 265.
Antioch, first community of Christians, i. 40; principal church of Asia, i. 50; School, i. 151 sq.; Synod, i. 142.
Antiphonic chant, i. 206.
Antitactes, i. 93.
Antitrinitarians, i. 96 sq.
Antonelli, ii. 402 sq.
Antoninus, of Florence, i. 21; Pius, i. 56.
Apelles, Gnostic, i. 94.
Apocrisiaries, i. 132.
Apocryphal Gospels, i. 38.
Apollinaris, of Hierapolis, i. 67; of Laodicea, i. 170.
Apollonius of Tyana, i. 63 sq.
Apologists, i. 65 sq., 126 sq.
Apostles, i. 35.
Apostolical Council, i. 41.
Apostolic Brethren, ii. 98; Canons and Constitutions, i. 82; Fathers, i. 81.
Appeals to the Pope, i. 142; from the Pope to an œcumenical council, ii. 27, 32, 41; to the State, ii. 246, 360.
Appellants, ii. 282 sq.
Aquaviva, ii. 278.
Aranda, ii. 305.
Arausicanum, Council, i. 177.
Arcadius, i. 124, 154.
Archdeaconries, i. 272.
Archdeacons, i. 132, 272.
Archives, ecclesiastical, i. 132.
Archpresbyter, i. 132, 272.
Aresen, ii. 215.
Ariald, i. 281.
Arianism, i. 162 sq.
Ariminum, Synod, i. 168.
Aristides, Apologist, i. 67.
Aristolaus, Tribune, i. 180.
Aristotle, i. 32; ii. 79.
Arius, i. 162 sq.
Arles, Synods, i. 106, 116, 166.
Armagh, i. 279.
Armenians, i. 186; ii. 95, 333.
Arminius, ii. 268 sq.
Armorica, i. 227.
Arnauld, ii. 258, 279.
Arndt, i. 270.
Arno, Bp., i. 239.
Arnobius, Apologist, i. 67, 88.
Arnold, of Brescia, i. 334, ii. 98; of Citeaux, ii. 101; historian, i. 24.
Arnoldi, Bp. of Treves, ii. 424.
Arnulph, Archbp. of Rheims, i. 276; King, i. 257.
Ars moriendi, ii. 128.
Artabasdus, i. 292.
Artemon, i. 96.
Ascetics, i. 116.
Asclepiadotos, i. 96.
Ascosnaghes, i. 186.
Asylum, right of, i. 130, 310.
Athanasius, i.127,152,164 sq., 170.
Athenagoras, Apologist, i. 67, 83.
Athens, Neoplatonic School, i. 126.
Attila, i. 221.
Atto of Vercelli, i. 290.
Auctorem fidei, ii. 247.
Audientes, i. 104, 110.
Audius, i. 212.
Audomar, i. 233.
Augsburg, Diet and Confession of, ii. 166; Interim, ii. 174; Religious Peace, ii. 175.
Augustine, of Canterbury, i. 227 sq., 283; St., i. 127, 157 sq., 174 sq., 179; Triumphus, ii. 18.
Augustinian Hermits, ii. 67.
Aurelian, Emperor, i. 58.
Aurelius, of Carthage, i. 175; Marcus, i. 56.
Ausculta fili, i. 361.
Autbert, i. 240.
Autharis, i. 223.
Autos-da-fé, ii. 106.
Avari, i. 239.
Averroes, philosopher, ii. 79.
Avicebron, philosopher, ii. 79.
Avignon, ii. 12 sq.
Avila, ii. 232, 258.
Avitus, Bp. of Vienne, i. 221.
Azevedo, ii. 144.
Azyme, i. 108; ii. 96.

BACON, Roger, ii. 83; of Verulam, ii. 292.
Baden, ii. 350 sq., 362 sq.; Articles of, ii. 377.
Badia, Thomas, ii. 232.
Badin, ii. 316.
Bahram V., i. 118.
Bahrdt, ii. 299.
Bail, ii. 258.
Baines, ii. 394.
Baius, ii. 276 sq.
Balde, ii. 309.
Baldwin, i. 314.
Ballerini, ii. 250, 259.
Balmez, ii. 106.
Balsamon, i. 299.
Baltimore Councils, ii. 315 sqq.
Baltimore, Lord, ii. 148.
Bangor, Monastery, i. 285.
Bannez, ii. 257, 277.
Baptism, i. 103 sq.; of children, i. 105.
Baptisteries, i. 104, 206.
Baptists, ii. 275.
Baradai, i. 187.
Baraga, ii. 321.
Barclay, ii. 274.
Bar-Cochba, i. 48, 55.
Bardas, i. 295.
Bardesanes, Gnostic, i. 94.
Barlaam, ii. 94.
Barletta, Gabriel, ii. 129.
Barlow, ii. 201.
Barnabas, i. 81.
Barnabites, ii. 238.
Barnave, ii. 335.
Baronius, ii. 243, 259.
Barruel, ii. 334.
Barsumas, Abbot, i. 183; Bp. of Nisibis, i. 181.
Bartholomew, of Lucca, i. 21; de Martyribus, ii. 232; de Medina, ii. 258; Night of St., ii. 187 sq.
Basedow, ii. 299.
Basilicas, i. 204.
Basilides, Bishop, i. 75; Gnostic, i. 91.
Basiliscus, i. 184.
Basilius, of Ancyra, i. 167; the Great, i. 152 sq., 213; the Macedonian, i. 296.
Basle, Council, ii. 33 sq.
Basnage, i. 25.
Bassi, ii. 236.
Bathory, Stephen, ii. 216 sq.
Baumgarten, ii. 272, 297.

Digitized by Google

Baur, i. 24; ii. 413.
Bautain, ii. 409.
Bavaria, i. 232 sq.; ii. 345 sq., 362 sq.
Baxter, ii. 275.
Bayle, ii. 295.
Bayley, Archbp., ii. 321 sq.
Béarn, ii. 185.
Beaton, ii. 202.
Beatus of Libana, i. 300.
Bec, Monastery, i. 291.
Becanus, ii. 257.
Bechetti, i. 22.
Becker, ii. 301.
Becket (*see* Thomas).
Beda Venerabilis, i. 21, 286.
Bedini, ii. 321.
Belgium, i. 233; ii. 380 sq.
Belisarius, i. 141, 221.
Bellarmine, ii. 243, 257.
Bellay, ii. 182.
Benedict, of Aniane, i. 284, 300; of Levita, i. 274; of Nursia, i. 282; Order of St., i. 222, 282, ii. 240.
Benedict, Pope (I.), i. 147; (IV.), i. 255, 259; (V., VI.), i. 262; (VII.), i. 263; (VIII.), i. 263; (IX.), i. 264; (XI.), ii. 12 sq.; (XII.), ii. 20 sq.; (XIII.), ii. 248; (XIV.), ii. 248, 283.
Benedictina, ii. 72.
Benignus, i. 225.
Bennet, Biscop, i. 286.
Benno, Bp. of Meissen, i. 245.
Berault-Bercastel, i. 22.
Berengarius, of Friuli, i. 257 sq.; of Ivrea, i. 260; of Tours, i. 304.
Bergier, ii. 296.
Berington, ii. 352, 394.
Berkeley, ii. 293.
Bernard, of Clairvaux, i. 335, ii. 61, 84; missionary, i. 317.
Bernardines, ii. 61.
Bernetti, ii. 409.
Bernhardi, Barth., ii. 160.
Berno, i. 290.
Bertha of Kent, i. 227.
Berthold, of Calabria, ii. 62; of Chiemsee, ii. 257; of Livonia, i. 319; of Ratisbon, ii. 129.
Berti, i. 22.
Berulle, ii. 238, 258.
Beryllus, i. 86, 97.
Beser, i. 291.
Bessarion, ii. 90, 94.
Beza, Theodore, ii. 182.
Beziers, Roger, ii. 101.
Bianchi, ii. 259.
Bible editions, ii. 130.
Bible Societies, Protestant, ii. 338.
Biblia pauperum, ii. 127.
Bichi, ii. 248.
Biel, Gabriel, ii. 65, 86, 129.
Bileamites, i. 89.
Binterim, ii. 412.
Birinus, i. 229.
Bishopric, Anglo-Prussian, ii. 334.
Bishops, i. 67 sq., 136 sq.
Bismarck, ii. 359 sqq.
Blanc, i. 22.
Blanchet, ii. 318.
Blandrata, ii. 218.
Blastares, i. 299.
Blastus, i. 84.
Blau, i. 301.
Blood, phials of, ii. 426.
Bludoff, ii. 386.
Blum, Bp., ii. 353, 363.
Bobbiv, Monastery, i. 232.
Boccaccio, ii. 90.
Boehme, ii. 270.
Boethius, i. 222.
Bogomiles, ii. 95, 99.
Bogoris, i. 245.
Bohemia, i. 243.
Bohemian Brethren, ii. 116.
Boleslaw (I.), i. 244; Chrobry, i. 244, 317; (II.) the Pious, i. 244.
Boleyn, Anne, ii. 194 sq.
Bolgeni, ii. 259.
Bolingbroke, ii. 293.
Boll, ii. 351.
Bollandists, ii. 259.
Bolsena, miracle, ii. 119.
Bommel, ii. 382.
Bonald, ii. 366 sq., 409.
Bonaventure, ii. 81, 168.
Boniface, Pope (I.), i. 144 sq.; (II.), i. 146, 177; (III., IV., V.), i. 147; (VI.), i. 257; (VII.), i. 263; (VIII.), i. 358 sq.; (IX.), ii. 25 sq.
Boniface, St., i. 233 sqq.
Bonnetty, ii. 409.
Bonosus, Bp. of Sardica, i. 208.
Bora, Catherine, ii. 163.
Bordeaux, Synod, i. 172.
Borgia, Cæsar, ii. 44; Francis, ii. 235; John, ii. 44; Lucretia, ii. 45.
Borromeo, ii. 232, 238.
Borziwoi, i. 243.
Bosio, ii. 259.
Bossuet, i. 22; ii. 247, 258, 287.
Boulogne, i. 366.
Bourdaloue, ii. 259.
Bradaez, ii. 116.
Bradwardine, Thomas, ii. 86, 107.
Branco, ii. 330.
Braun, Hermesian, ii. 409.
Brazil, ii. 144, 329.
Bread for the Eucharist, i. 108.
Brebeuf, ii. 150.
Bremen, Bishopric, ii. 240.
Brendel, ii. 233.
Brest, Synod, ii. 290.
Bretagne, i. 227.
Bridget, St., i. 225; ii. 23, 65, 130.
Brigham Young, ii. 421.
British Isles, i. 224 sqq., 278 sqq.
Broglie of Ghent, ii. 381.
Brothers, of the Common Life, ii. 65; of Mercy, ii. 239; the four tall, i. 188.
Brownists, ii. 199.
Brownson, ii. 324.
Brunner, ii. 302; Francis de Sales, ii. 320.
Bruno, of Cologne, i. 280, ii. 60; the Saxon, i. 237.
Bruté, ii. 316.
Bucer, ii. 169.
Buck, De, ii. 382.
Budæus, ii. 93.
Bugenhagen, ii. 215.
Buil, ii. 142.
Bulgarians, i. 245.
Bunsen, ii. 413, 415.
Burchard, Bp., i. 236, 280, 289.
Burdett, ii. 390.
Burgundians, i. 221.
Burial-places, i. 116.
Buridan, J., ii. 86.
Bursfeld, congregation, ii. 72.
Bus, Cæsar de, ii. 239.
Butler, ii. 394.
Byzantines, i. 21.

CADALUS of Parma, i. 267.
Cæcilian of Carthage, i. 159.
Cæcilius, Priest, i. 88.
Cælestius, i. 174 sq.
Cæsaraugusta, Synod, i. 171.
Cæsarea, i. 50, 73.
Cæsarius, Bp. of Arles, i. 177.
Cæsars, i. 125.
Cajetanus, ii. 156, 232, 238.
Cajus, Presbyter, i. 99; Pope, i. 80.
Calasanctius, Joseph, ii. 239.
Calderon, ii. 309.
Caledonians, i. 226.
Calendar, Julian, ii. 241.
Caliphs, i. 247.
Calixtines, ii. 115.
Calixtus, of Helmstädt, ii. 268.
Calixtus, Pope (II.), i. 317, 332.
Callistus, Pope, i. 79, 109.
Calmet, i. 257.
Calvin, ii. 179, 260.
Camaldoli, i. 282, 284.
Camisardes, ii. 191.
Campeggio, ii. 161, 195.
Canada, ii. 152, 326.
Candidian, i. 179.

Digitized by Google

Canisius, ii. 233.
Canning, ii. 389.
Cano, Melchior, ii. 235.
Canon of the Mass, i. 201.
Canonici, i. 272.
Canonists, in the Middle Ages, ii. 89; in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, ii. 259; modern, ii. 411.
Canonization, i. 307.
Canons, apostolic, i. 82.
Canossa, i. 325 sq.
Canterbury, metropolis, i. 227.
Cantus, i. 206.
Capetique, i. 22.
Capistranus, ii. 129.
Capito, ii. 177.
Capreolus, ii. 86.
Capuchins, ii. 236 sq.
Caracalla, Emperor, i. 57.
Caraccioli, ii. 158.
Cardenas, ii. 145.
Cardinals, i. 265, 273; ii. 54.
Carlstadt, ii. 157.
Carmelites, ii. 62, 240.
Caroline Books, i. 294.
Carpocrates, Gnostic, i. 93
Carpzov, ii. 127, 271.
Carroll, Bp., ii. 312 sq.
Cartesius, ii. 292.
Carthage, Synod, i. 176.
Carthusians, ii. 60.
Casas, Barth. de las, ii. 142 sqq.
Casimir of Poland, i. 244.
Cassander, ii. 220.
Cassian of St. Victor, i. 177.
Cassidorus, i. 20, 222.
Cataldiuo, ii. 145.
Catechismus Romanus, ii. 230.
Cathari, ii. 99 sqq.
Catherine, of Aragon, ii. 194; of Genoa, ii. 130; de Médicis, ii. 184 sq.; of Russia, ii. 184; of Siena, ii. 23, 130.
Cavour, ii. 375, 402.
Ceadwalla, King, i. 229.
Cedd, i. 229.
Celestine, Pope (I.), i. 142 sq., 176 sq., 224; (II.), i. 333; (III.), i. 344; (V.), i. 358.
Celestinian Hermits, ii. 61.
Celibacy, i. 133 sq.
Cellites, ii. 63.
Celsus, i. 63.
Centuriators of Magdeburg, i. 21, 24.
Cerdo, Gnostic, i. 94.
Cerinth, i. 89.
Cerularius, Michael, i. 298.
Cervantes, ii. 38.
Cervini, ii. 227.
Chalcedon, i. 138, 183 sq.
Challoner, ii. 394.
Chalmers, ii. 420.
Chapters, collegiate and cathedral, i. 272.
Charlemagne, i. 237 sq., 252 sq.
Charles, of Anjou, i. 355; V., Emperor, ii. 158 sq.; IX. of France, i. 184 sq.; X., i. 190 sq.; Martel, i. 233 sq., 249, 268; of Suedermanland, ii. 44; Theodore, Elector, ii. 253; of Valois, ii. 14.
Charta, caritatis, ii. 61; libertatis, i. 348.
Chateaubriand, ii. 365.
Châtel, ii. 367, 423.
Chauvelin, ii. 305.
Chazari, i. 246.
Chelm, united diocese, ii. 388.
Chemnitz, ii. 267.
Cherier, i. 23.
Cheverus, ii. 313 sq.
Chieregati, ii. 161.
Chiersy (Quiercy), i. 302.
Chigi, ii. 161.
Chili, ii. 144.
Chiliasm, i. 99.
Chinese usages, ii. 138.
Chiquitos, ii. 145.
Choir of the Church, i. 205.
Choiseul, ii. 246.
Chorbishops, i. 72, 133, 272.
Chrism, i. 105.
Christian, (II., III.) of Denmark, ii. 213 sq.; (IV.), ii. 221; missionary, i. 319 sq.
Christopher, i. 259.
Chrodogang, i. 272.
Chrysaphius, i. 182.
Chrysolanus, ii. 93.
Chrysostom, i. 143, 154 sq., 188.
Chubb, ii. 293.
Cid, i. 321.
Cimabue, ii. 123.
Cingulum, i. 207.
Circumcellions, i. 160.
Cirta, Synod, i. 159.
Cistercians, ii. 61.
Citeaux, ii. 61.
Civil constitution, ii. 335.
Civil marriage, ii. 330.
Clara, St., of Assisi, ii. 66.
Clarendon, Diet, i. 342.
Claudius, Emperor, i. 44; of Turin, i. 288, 294, ii. 102.
Clementina, i. 89.
Clementines, ii. 54.
Clement, of Alexandria, i. 67; Augustus of Cologne, ii. 349; heretic, i. 236; James, ii. 190; philosopher, ii. 410; Wenceslaus of Treves, ii. 253.
Clement, Pope (I.), i. 75 sq.; (II.), i. 264, 280; (III.), i. 326, 344; (V.), ii. 13 sqq.; (VI.), ii. 21; (VII.), ii. 194; (VIII.), ii. 242, 277; (IX.), ii. 244; (XI.), ii. 248, 280 sq.; (XII.), ii. 248; (XIII.), ii. 250, 305 sq.; (XIV.), ii. 250, 306.
Cleomenes, i. 97.
Clergy, i. 67 sq.
Clerici et Fratres vitae communis, ii. 65.
Cletus, Pope, i. 78.
Clovis, i. 223.
Clugny, abbey, i. 284.
Cobbett, ii. 394.
Cobham, ii. 111.
Cochem, ii. 260.
Codde, ii. 269, 283.
Cœlius Sedulius, i. 207.
Coena Domini, Bull, ii. 241.
Colenso, ii. 420.
Colet, ii. 93.
Coligny, ii. 183.
Collegia pietatis, ii. 271.
Collegiants, ii. 269.
Collegium, Germanicum, ii. 241; Urbanum, ii. 243.
Collins, ii. 293.
Collyridians, i. 208.
Colman, i. 231.
Columba, St., i. 226.
Columban, St. i. 232.
Columbino, ii. 63.
Columbus, ii. 141.
Comboni, ii. 330.
Commendone, ii. 232.
Commodus, i. 56.
Communion, i. 108, 201, 305.
Comonfort, ii. 328.
Compact of Prague, ii. 116.
Competentes, i. 104.
Compline, i. 211.
Comte, ii. 410.
Conceptio immaculata, ii. 125.
Conclave, i. 357.
Concordia of Wittenberg, ii. 169.
Condé, Prince, ii. 183.
Condillac, ii. 296.
Confessio, Augustana, ii. 166; Havnica, ii. 215; tetrapolitana, ii. 168.
Confession, i. 109; ii. 120.
Confessors, i. 105.
Confucius, ii. 138.
Congregatio, de auxiliis, ii. 277; de propaganda fide, ii. 135.
Congregation, of the Holy Ghost, ii. 330; of the Lord, ii. 202; of Satan, ii. 202.
Congregationalists, ii. 199, 421.
Congruism, ii. 278.
Connolly, ii. 314.
Conrad (II.), i. 264; (III.), i. 334.

Digitized by Google

Conradin, i. 354 sq.
Consalvi, ii. 400.
Consensus, fidei repetitus, etc., ii. 268; Dresdensis, ii. 266.
Consistentes, i. 110.
Consistories, ii. 164, 180.
Consolamentum, ii. 100.
Constance, Treaty, i. 325; Council, ii. 29 sq.
Constans, i. 120.
Constantia, i. 345.
Constantine, the Great, i. 60, 120; (II.), i. 120; Copronymus, i. 292; Pogonatus, i. 193.
Constantinople, i. 137, 171, 190.
Constantius, Chlorus, i. 58; Arian, i. 120 sqq.
Constitutum of Pope Vigilius, i. 190.
Contarini, Cardinal, ii. 232.
Contenson, ii. 258.
Convention, French, ii. 336.
Convulsionaries, ii. 283.
Copernicus, ii. 244.
Coptic Christians, i. 186; ii. 291, 331.
Corbinian, St., i. 233.
Corcoran, ii. 324.
Cornelius a Lapide, ii. 257.
Cornelius, Pope, i. 75, 79, 111.
Cornet, ii. 279.
Corpa, Peter de, ii. 147.
Corporale, i. 207.
Corporation Act, ii. 206.
Corpus, doctrinae Philippicum, ii. 266; Evangelicorum, etc., ii. 222; juris canonici, ii. 54.
Corpwald, i. 228.
Correggio, ii. 123.
Corruptibilists, i. 186.
Cortese, ii. 232.
Cortez, ii. 143.
Councils, Œcumenical, i. 149 sqq.
Cournault, ii. 180.
Courtnay, ii. 108 sq.
Cranmer, Thomas, ii. 195 sqq.
Crell, Chancellor, ii. 267.
Crescentians, i. 262 sq.
Crispus, i. 120.
Cromwell, Thomas, ii. 195 sqq.
Crypto-Calvinists, ii. 267.
Culdees, i. 279.
Cullen, Cardinal, ii. 392.
Cultur-kampf, ii. 359 sqq.
Cumulatio beneficiorum, ii. 55.
Curtis, ii. 390.
Customs, hereditary, in England, i. 342.
Cyprian, i. 58, 75 sq., 88, 110.
Cyran, ii. 278.
Cyril, of Alexandria, i. 127, 179 sq.; of Jerusalem, i. 154; Monk, i. 243.
Cyrila, Arian Bishop, i. 220.
Cyrus of Phasis, i. 191.
Czerski, ii. 424.

DAGOBERT, i. 224.
Dahomey, ii. 330.
D'Ailly, ii. 29 sq.
Dalberg, John, ii. 303.
D'Alembert, ii. 295.
Dallas, ii. 394.
D'Allemand, ii. 36 sq.
Dalmatius, Abbot, i. 180.
Damasus, Pope (I.), i. 143, 171; ii. 264, 280.
Damian, Peter, i. 280, 291.
Dance, of Death, ii. 128; St. Guy's, ii. 121.
Daniel, Bp. of Winchester, 235; missionary, ii. 151.
Dante, ii. 83.
Danton, ii. 336.
Darbyites, ii. 421.
Darras, i. 22.
Daub, i. 413.
David, of Augsburg, ii. 85; of Dinanto, ii. 99; St., i. 227.
Deaconesses, i. 71 sq.
Deacons, i. 71.
Dean, i. 272.
Dechamps, Cardinal, ii. 383.
Decius, Emperor, i. 57.
Decretals, Pseudo-Isidorean, i. 150, 273 sq.
Defensores, i. 132.
Deists, English, ii. 291 sqq.
Del Monte, ii. 227.
Delsignore, i. 22.
Demetrius, Bp. of Alexandria, i. 85 sq.
Demiurgus, i. 90.
Denmark, i. 239; ii. 213, 221.
De Smet, ii. 318 sq.
D'Espence, ii. 184.
Desservants in France, ii. 367.
Deuberia, ii. 332.
Devay, ii. 218.
Dhu-Nowas, i. 118.
Diderot, ii. 295.
Didier, de la Cour, ii. 240; la Mothe, ii. 63.
Didymus, the Blind, i. 154; Gabriel, ii. 160.
Diego, Bp. of Osma, ii. 65.
Diocletian, i. 58.
Diodorus of Tarsus, i. 152, 181.
Diognetus, i. 67.
Dionysius, Areopagita, i. 73; of Alexandria, i. 75, 80, 87, 97; Carthusian, ii. 88; of Corinth, i. 78; of Milan, i. 167.
Dionysius, Pope, i. 75, 80, 97.
Dioscorus of Alexandria, i. 182.
Diplomatics, i. 18.
Diptychs, i. 202.
Discipline Book of Knox, ii. 202.
Discipline of the Secret, i. 66, 111 sq., 199.
Dissenters, ii. 420.
Diuma, i. 229.
Dodwell, i. 62.
Dogmatic teachers, ii. 257, 408.
Doketism, i. 91.
Dolcino, ii. 98.
Döllinger, i. 23; ii. 406, 410, 424.
Dombrowka, i. 244.
Dominic, ii. 65 sqq., 101.
Domitian, Bp. of Ancyra, i. 188; Emperor, i. 55.
Domnus of Antioch, i. 182.
Domnus, Pope, i. 148.
Donatio Constantini, i. 252.
Donatists, i. 159 sq.
Donatus, Bp. of Casæ Nigræ, i. 160; of Carthage, i. 160; of Dublin, i. 279.
Dordrecht, Synod, ii. 269.
Dorner, ii. 414.
Dorotheus, i. 152.
Dorovernum (Canterbury), i. 227.
Dorsch, i. 301.
Dositheus, i. 90.
Douay, ii. 200, 399.
Dovin, Synod, i. 118.
Doyle, ii. 391.
Drahomira, i. 244.
Drexelius, ii. 258.
Drontheim, metropolis, i. 242.
Droste-Vischering, Bishop, ii. 340.
Druillettes, ii. 150.
Dubois, ii. 313 sq.
Dubourg, ii. 313 sq.
Dubricius, St., i. 227.
Ducreux, i. 22.
Dumont, ii. 383.
Dungal, Monk, i. 295.
Dunin, Martin, ii. 349.
Duns Scotus, ii. 82.
Dunstan of Canterbury, i. 278, 290.
Dupin, ii. 307.
Durandus of St. Pourçain, ii. 85.
Dürer, Albert, ii. 124.
Duserres, ii. 191.

EADBALD of Kent, i. 228.
Easter, i. 112 sq.
Ebbo, of Grenoble, i. 302; of Rheims, i. 239, 276.
Eberhard, of Friuli, i. 300;

Digitized by Google

John Augustus (Professor), ii. 298.
Ebionites, i. 89.
Eccehard (I., II.), i. 289; (IV.), i. 290.
Eccleston, ii. 316.
Eck, John, ii. 157 sq.
Eckhart, Master, ii. 86.
Edbert, i. 229.
Edelmann, ii. 299.
Edessa, Christianity in, i. 50; School, i. 152.
Edgar, King, i. 278.
Edward, the Confessor, i. 278; (I., II.), ii. 15 sqq.; (VI.), ii. 199 sqq.
Edwin of Northumbria, i. 228.
Egalité, Philip, ii. 336.
Egan, ii. 313.
Egmont, ii. 193.
Eichhorn, ii. 298, 415.
Einhard, i. 288.
Ekebolis, i. 121.
Ekthesis of Heraclius, i. 193.
Elesbaan, i. 118.
Eleutherius, Pope, i. 79.
Elias, of Cortona, ii. 69; of Jerusalem, i. 185.
Eligius of Novon, i. 233.
Elipandus of Toledo, i. 290.
Elizabeth, ii. 129; of England, ii. 198 sqq.
Elkesaites, i. 89.
Elvenich, ii. 409.
Elvira, Synod, i. 50, 135.
Emancipation of the Catholics, ii. 388 sqq.
Emery, ii. 313.
Emmeran, St., i. 232.
Emmeria, Joseph, Archbp., ii. 253.
Emmerich, Catherine, ii. 428.
Ems, Punctuation, ii. 254.
Emser, ii. 157.
Endura, ii. 100.
Engelbert of Admont, ii. 21.
Engelhardt, i. 25.
England, John, ii. 314.
English Young Ladies, ii. 239.
Enkratites, i. 83, 94.
Enlightenment, false, ii. 291, 407.
Ennodius of Pavia, i. 146.
Eparchies, i. 137.
Ephesus, Council, i. 176, 179.
Ephraem, of Antioch, i. 188; of Syria, i. 155.
Epigonus, i. 97.
Epiklesis, ii. 96.
Epiphanes, Gnostic, i. 93.
Epiphanius of Salamis, i. 155, 188.
Epiphany, i. 112.
Episcopal Church, ii. 197 sqq., 419.
Episcopius, ii. 268.
Episcopus in partibus, i. 272.
Erasmus, ii. 92, 164 sq.
Erich, (I.) i. 240; (II.), i. 240; (III.), i. 240.
Erigena (*see* Scotus).
Erimbert, i. 241.
Ernest, of Bavaria, ii. 233; of Mengerdorf, ii. 233.
Ernesti, ii. 297.
Eskyl of Lund, i. 336.
Espartero, ii. 372.
Espen, Van, ii. 249.
Essenes, i. 31.
Essex, i. 228.
Este, ii. 232.
Esthonians, i. 319.
Estius, ii. 257.
Ethelbert of Kent, i. 227.
Ethelburga, i. 228.
Ethelwald, Bp. of Winchester, i. 278.
Etherius, Bp. of Osma, i. 300.
Eucharist, i. 106 sq., 302 sq., 349.
Euchites, i. 212.
Eudokia, i. 182.
Eudoxia, i. 154.
Eudoxius, of Antioch, i. 169; of Constantinople, i. 170.
Eugene, Pope (I.), i. 148; (II.), i. 254; (III.), i. 334; (IV.), ii. 32 sqq.
Eugenius, Emperor, i. 124; of Ephesus, ii. 94, 97.
Eulogius of Corduba, i. 321.
Eulogy, i. 108.
Eunapius, i. 125.
Eunomians, i. 167.
Euric, i. 219.
Eusebians, i. 164.
Eusebius, Bp. of Cæsarea, i. 20, 127, 152, 163, 187; of Dorylæum, i. 182; of Emesa, i. 154; of Nicomedia, i. 120, 163 sq.; of Vercelli, i. 167, 213.
Eustathius, of Antioch, i. 164; of Sebaste, i. 135, 212; Pope, i. 80.
Euthymius Zigabenus, i. 299.
Eutropius, i. 154.
Eutyches, i. 181 sqq.
Eutychianus, Pope, i. 80.
Evagrius, i. 20.
Evangelicals, ii. 419.
Evaristus, Pope, i. 78.
Evremonde, ii. 295.
Ewald, i. 237.
Exarchs, i. 137.
Excommunication, i. 204, 306.
Exegesis, i. 152; ii. 87, 257, 411.
Exemptions, i. 284.
Exomologesis, i. 109.
Exorcists, i. 72.
Extravagants, ii. 54.
Eybel, ii. 251.
Eyk, ii. 124.
Eyre, ii. 399.
Ezzelino, i. 351.

FABER, of Constance, ii. 177; convert, ii. 397; Jesuit, ii. 235.
Fabian, Pope, i. 50, 79.
Fagnani, ii. 259.
Farel, ii. 178, 182.
Farnese, ii. 232.
Farrars, ii. 419.
Fast days, i. 114.
Fathers of the Church, i. 151 sqq.
Fausta, i. 120.
Faustus, i. 120; Bp. of Riez, i. 177.
Feasts, i. 112.
Febronius, ii. 249 sq.
Felicissimus, i. 110.
Felicitas, i. 57.
Felinski, ii. 387.
Felix, of Aptunga, i. 159; of Burgundy, i. 229; of Urgel, i. 299; of Valois, ii. 64.
Felix, Pope (I.), i. 80; (III or II.), i. 145; (IV. or III.), i. 146.
Fénelon, ii. 259, 285.
Fenwick, Edward, ii. 313; Benedict, ii. 313.
Ferdinand (I.), ii. 233; the Catholic, ii. 105.
Ferrara, Council, ii. 37, 94.
Fesch, Cardinal, ii. 340.
Fichte, ii. 298.
Fiesole, ii. 123.
Filastre, ii. 29.
Filioque, i. 170; ii. 96.
Finland, i. 318.
Firmian, ii. 286.
Firmicus Maternus, i. 127.
Firmilian of Cæsarea, i. 76 sq
Fisher, Bp. of Rochester, ii. 93, 195.
Fistula eucharistica, i. 305.
Flacius Illyricus, i. 24; ii. 266.
Flagellants, ii. 121.
Flaget, ii. 313.
Flavian, Pt. of Antioch, i. 185; of Constantinople, i. 182 sq.
Flavius Clemens, i. 85.
Flentes, i. 110.
Fletcher, ii. 273, 394.
Fleury, i. 22.
Flodoard, i. 259, 290.
Florence, ii. 95.
Florinus, heretic, i. 84.
Florus, Gessius, i. 47; Magister, i. 302.
Flotte, Peter, i. 363.
Fonseca, ii. 277.
Fontainebleau, ii. 341.
Fontevrault, Order, ii. 62.

Digitized by Google

Forbin-Janson, Bp. of Nancy, ii. 311.
Form of Concord, ii. 267.
Formosus, Pope, i. 257.
Formula Hormisdæ, i. 141.
Formularies, i. 306.
Fortunatus, i. 111.
Fossors, i. 133.
Fox, ii. 274.
Fra Bartolomeo, ii. 123.
Frances, St., ii. 239.
Francis, of Assisi, ii. 65 sq.; (I.) of France, ii. 182; (II.), ii. 183; (II., Emperor), ii. 353; Joseph, Emperor, ii. 357; of Mavronis, ii. 82; of Paula, ii. 65; de Sales, ii. 233, 239; Solanus, ii. 143; of Xavier, ii. 135.
Franciscan Orders, ii. 65 sq.
Francisca Romana, ii. 63.
Frangipani, Cencius, i. 332.
Franke, ii. 271.
Frankenberg, Cardinal, ii. 253.
Frankfort, Diet, ii. 21; Synod, i. 294, 300.
Franks, i. 223.
Fransoni, Archbp. of Turin, ii. 375.
Fratricelli, ii. 17, 70, 132.
Frayssinous, ii. 366.
Fredegar, i. 286.
Frederic, of Denmark, ii. 215; (I.) Emperor, i. 313, 336 sq.; (II.), i. 314, 347; of Prussia (II.), ii. 297; William (I.), ii. 286; (III.), ii. 415; (IV.), ii. 416; of the Palatinate, ii. 220; of Saxony, ii. 156.
Free Kirk of Scotland, ii. 420.
Freemasonry, ii. 248 sq., 294.
Free-thinkers, ii. 293.
Friars, Minor, ii. 65 sq.; Preachers, ii. 66 sq.
Fridolin, St., i. 231.
Friends of God, ii. 86.
Frint, ii. 354.
Frohschammer, ii. 409.
Fructus medii temporis, ii. 51.
Frumentius, i. 119.
Fuessen, Monastery, i. 232.
Fulbert of Chartres, i. 290.
Fulda, Monastery, i. 236; School, i. 288.
Fulgentius of Ruspe, i. 177, 220.
Fullo, Peter, i. 184.
Funk, ii. 265.

GABOR, ii. 218.
Gaetano (Cajetan) of Thiene, ii. 238.
Galerius, i. 58.
Galileans, i. 31.
Galileo, ii. 244.
Gall, St., i. 232, 288, 290.
Gallican Articles, ii. 246.
Gallienus, i. 58.
Gallitzin, ii. 313.
Gallus, Cestius, i. 47; Emperor, i. 58.
Gams, i. 23.
Gangra, Synod, i. 135.
Garcia Moreno, ii. 329.
Gardine, ii. 197.
Garibaldi, ii. 403
Garnet, Jesuit, ii. 204.
Gaston, ii. 63.
Gaunillo, ii. 76.
Gauzbert, i. 241.
Gavazzi, ii. 321.
Geilana, i. 233.
Geiler of Kaisersberg, ii. 129.
Geisa, i. 246.
Geissel, Archbp. of Cologne, ii. 349, 356.
Gelasius (I.), i. 145; (II.), i. 332.
Gelimer, i. 221.
Gemistius Pletho, ii. 91.
General seminaries, ii. 252.
General Synod, Prussian, ii. 416.
Geneva, ii. 179 sq.
Gennadius, ii. 95.
Genseric, i. 220.
Genuflectentes, i. 110.
George, of Cappadocia, i. 167; of Saxony, ii. 157.
Gerbert, i. 290, 302.
Gerhard, ii. 70.
Gerizim, i. 32.
German Mysticism, ii. 86.
"German Theology," ii. 87.
Germanus, Bp. of Auxerre, i. 224; of Constantinople, i. 291.
Gersen, ii. 87.
Gerson, ii. 30, 86, 87.
Gesta regum Francorum, i. 286.
Gewilieb, i. 236.
Ghibellines, i. 345.
Ghiberti of Florence, ii. 124.
Gibault, ii. 152.
Gibbons, ii. 326.
Giberto, ii. 232.
Gichtel, ii. 270.
Gieseler, i. 24.
Gilbert de la Porré, ii. 77.
Gildas, i. 285.
Giotto, ii. 123.
Gizzi, ii. 401.
Gladiatorial combats, forbidden, i. 128.
Gladstone, ii. 398.
Gmeiner, i. 23; ii. 244.
Goa, Archbishopric, ii. 310.
Goch, John, ii. 132.
Godeau, i. 22.
Godfrey de Bouillon, i. 312; Lukina, i. 319.
Goethe, ii. 298.
Goffine, ii. 260.
Golden Bull, ii. 22.
Goldhagen, ii. 260, 302.
Gomarus, ii. 268.
Gonzaga, ii. 228.
Gonzalez Tellez, ii. 259.
Gordian, i. 57.
Gorham, ii. 420.
Gorm, the Elder, i. 240.
Görres, ii. 346, 427.
Gospel, Everlasting (*see* Introductorius, liber).
Gother, ii. 394.
Gottschalk, Duke, i. 245, 318; heretic, i. 301.
Götze in Hamburg, ii. 299.
Gouban, ii. 381.
Goupil, ii. 151.
Gozbert, Duke, i. 233.
Grammont, Order, ii. 60.
Granvella, Cardinal, ii. 192.
Gratian, Emperor, i. 123; John, ii. 89.
Grattan, ii. 389.
Greek refugees in the West, ii. 90.
Greek Schismatic Church, ii. 93.
Gregorian Chant, i. 206.
Gregory, Asbestas, i. 295; of Cappadocia, i. 165; the Illuminator, i. 118; of Nazianzen, i. 127, 153; of Nyssa, i. 154; Thaumaturgus, i. 86 sq.; of Tours, i. 21, 223, 286; of Utrecht, i. 236; of Valencia, ii. 257.
Gregory, Pope, the Great, i. 138, 147, 190, 227, 285; (II.), i. 234, 291; (III.), i. 235, 292; (IV.), i. 254; (V.), i. 263; (VI.), i. 264; (VII.), i. 282, 323 sq.; (VIII.), i. 332; (IX.), i. 350 sq.; (X.), i. 355; (XI.), ii. 23; (XII.), ii. 27; (XIII.), ii. 188, 220, 241; (XV.), ii. 243; (XVI.), ii. 400 sq.
Greith, Bp. of St. Gall, ii. 378.
Gretser, i. 257.
Grey, ii. 198.
Grievances of the German nation, ii. 161.
Grimoald, i. 223.
Groot, ii. 65.
Grotius, ii. 269.
Gualbertus, i. 284.
Gualo, i. 351.
Guerike, i. 25.
Gueux, ii. 193.
Guibert of Ravenna, i. 326.
Guido, husband of Marozia, i. 260; of Malesee, ii. 28; of Milan, i. 281 sq.; of Montpellier, ii. 63; of Spoleto, i. 257.
Guilbertines, ii. 62.
Guises, ii. 183 sq.

Digitized by Google

Gundobald, i. 221.
Guntamund, i. 220.
Günther, Anthony, ii. 409; Bp. of Cologne, i. 277.
Gustavus Adolphus, ii. 221; Association, ii. 417.
Guyon, Joanna, ii. 285.

HADRIAN, Emperor, i. 48, 55.
Hadrian Pope (I.), i. 293, 300; (II.), i. 297; (III.), i. 256, 277; (IV.), i. 336, 343; (VI.), ii. 161, 176; (VII.), ii. 280.
Hadumar, Bishop, i. 239.
Hakon, the Good, i. 242; Yarl, i. 242.
Hales, ii. 269.
Halitgar, of Cambray, i. 288; Monk, i. 239.
Haller, Berthold, ii. 178.
Hamburg, Bishopric, i. 240.
Hamelius, ii. 277.
Hamilton, ii. 201.
Hampden, ii. 420.
Haneberg, ii. 410.
Hanno of Cologne, i. 267.
Harless, ii. 414.
Harmonius, Gnostic, i. 94.
Harms, Claus, ii. 413.
Harold, King, i. 239; Blataand, i. 241.
Hartmann, ii. 413.
Hartwig, i. 318.
Hase, i. 25.
Hasse, i. 25.
Hassun, ii. 332.
Hatti-Humayun, ii. 332.
Hauteville, ii. 258.
Haymo, i. 21, 288.
Hebrews, i. 39.
Hecker, I. T., ii. 324.
Hedderich, ii. 301.
Heddo of Strasburg, i. 272.
Hefele, i. 23.
Hegel, ii. 408, 413.
Hegesippus, i. 20.
Heiss, ii. 325.
Held, ii. 170.
Heliand, i. 288.
Heliogabalus, Emperor, i. 57.
Hellenists, i. 39.
Heloise, ii. 78.
Helsen, ii. 423.
Helvetius, ii. 296.
Helvidius, i. 208, 212.
Hengstenberg, ii. 413.
Henke, i. 24; ii. 298.
Henni, ii. 318 sq.
Hennuyer, ii. 188.
Henoticon, i. 145, 185.
Henricians, ii. 98.
Henrion, i. 22.
Henry, of Anjou, ii. 188; of England (II.), i. 342; (I.), Emperor, i. 240; (II.), i. 262; (III.), i. 264; (IV.), i. 267, 324 sq.; (V.), i. 331; (VI.), i. 344; (VII.), ii. 15 sq.; (VIII.), ii. 194 sqq.; of France, ii. 182, 227; (IV.), i. 220; of Lausanne, ii. 98; of Navarre, ii. 187.
Hepidanus, i. 290.
Heraclas, i. 87.
Heracleon, Gnostic, i. 93.
Heraclius, Emperor, i. 191 sq.
Herbert of Cherbury, ii. 292.
Herder, ii. 98.
Hereford, i. 110.
Hergenröther, i. 23.
Heribert, Bishop, i. 239.
Herlembald, i. 282.
Herman, Contractus, i. 290; of Cologne, ii. 171.
Hermas, Pastor, i. 82.
Hermenegild, i. 219.
Hermeneuti, i. 132.
Hermes, ii. 408.
Hermias, Apologist, i. 84.
Hermits, i. 116, 213.
Hermogenes, i. 93.
Herod, i. 37; Agrippa (I.), i. 40.
Herodians, i. 31.
Heros, Bishop, i. 175.
Herrnhuters, ii. 271.
Hess, ii. 217.
Hesychasts, ii. 96.
Hetzer, ii. 177.
Hieracas, Gnostic, i. 99.
Hierocles, i. 65.
Hieronymites, ii. 64, 238.
Hierotheus, i. 246.
Hilarion, i. 213.
Hilary, Pope, i. 144; of Poitiers, i. 155 sq., 167; layman, i. 177.
Hilda, i. 230.
Hildebrand, Monk (Gregory VII.), i. 265.
Hildegardis, ii. 129.
Hilderic, i. 221.
Hildesheim, Bishopric, i. 239.
Himerius, Bp., i. 136.
Hincmar, of Laon, i. 256; of Rheims, i. 256, 276, 289, 295, 302.
Hindoos, ii. 135 sq.
Hippolyte, i. 87.
Hirsan, Abbey, i. 284.
Hirscher, ii. 411.
Hobbes, ii. 292.
Hofbauer, ii. 355.
Hofmann, ii. 268, 414.
Hofmeister, ii. 177.
Hogstraten, ii. 156.
Hohenlohe, ii. 406.
Hohenstaufens, i. 336.
Holbach, ii. 296.
Holbein, ii. 124.
Holtzendorf, ii. 415.
Homagium, i. 267, 333.
Homerites, i. 118.
Honorius, Emperor, i. 124.
Honorius, Pope (I.), i. 147, 192 sq.; (II.), i. 333; (III.), i. 314, 350; (IV.), i. 357.
Honter, ii. 218.
Hontheim (*see* Febronius).
Hoorne, ii. 193.
Horebites, ii. 115.
Hormisdas, Pope, i. 146, 177, 185 sq.
Horner, ii. 331.
Hornstein, ii. 351.
Hortig, i. 23.
Hosius, of Corduba, i. 163, 167; Stanislaus, ii. 216, 228, 257.
Hospitallers, ii. 63.
Hosts, i. 305.
Hottinger, i. 25.
Howard, ii. 394.
Huetius, ii. 296.
Hugh, of Langres, i. 304; of Provence, i. 260; of St. Caro, ii. 88; of St. Victor, ii. 84.
Hughes, ii. 317.
Huguenots in France, ii. 183 sq.
Humanists, ii. 89 sqq.
Humbert, Cardinal, i. 291.
Hume, ii. 294.
Humiliati, ii. 64.
Huneric, i. 220.
Hunni, Archbp. of Hamburg, i. 241.
Huns, i. 221.
Huschke, ii. 416.
Huss, John, and his sect, ii. 111 sq.
Hutten (*see* Ulric).
Hygin, of Corduba, i. 171.
Hyginus, Pope, i. 78.
Hymns, sacred, i. 207; ii. 124.
Hypatia, i. 126.
Hypsistarians, i. 212.

IBAS of Edessa, i. 181, 189.
Iconium, Synod, i. 105.
Iconoclasm, i. 291 sq.
Idacius of Emerita, i. 171.
Ignatius, of Antioch, i. 50, 55, 81; of Constantinople, i. 295; of Loyola, ii. 234, 258.
Ildephonse of Toledo, i. 285.
Illuminati, ii. 300, 302.
Images, of Christ, i. 210; symbolical, ii. 122; veneration, i. 209 sq.
Immunities of the Church, i. 129.
Imperium mundi of the West, i. 253 sq.
Incarnation, i. 178 sq., 299 sq.
In coena Domini, Bull, ii. 241.
Independents in England, ii. 205.

Digitized by Google

Index libr. prohibit., ii. 230.
Indulgences, ii. 229.
Infallibility, ii. 406.
Infralapsarians, ii. 209.
Inge, i. 241.
Ingolstadt, University, ii. 157, 344.
Innocent, Pope (I.), i. 143, 175; (II.), i. 333; (III.), i. 313, 345 sq.; ii. 101; (IV.), i. 315, 353 sq.; (VI.), ii. 22; (VII.), ii. 27; (VIII.), ii. 106; (X.), ii. 222, 244, 279; (XI.), ii. 244, 284; (XII.), ii. 247, 285; (XIII.), ii. 248.
Inquisition, Eccl., ii. 103, 242, 308; Spanish, ii. 103.
Instantius, Bishop, i. 171.
Insula Sanctorum (*see* § 79).
Intercession, right of the bishops, i. 130.
Interdict, i. 306.
Introductorius, liber, ii. 70.
Investiture, i. 269, 324.
Iona, i. 226.
Ireland, i. 224 sqq., 278; ii. 207, 388.
Irenæus, Bp. of Lyons, i. 57, 74, 79, 84.
Irene, Empress, i. 293.
Irmin, Column of, i. 237.
Irvingites, ii. 421.
Isaac of Antioch, i. 207.
Isabella of Spain, (I.) ii. 105; (II.), ii. 373.
Isenbiehl, ii. 300.
Isidorean Collection, i. 150, 273 sq.
Isidore, Gnostic, i. 92; of Kiew, ii. 95; of Seville, i. 273, 285.
Islam, i. 247 sq.
Isleif, Bishop, i. 242.
Isochristoi, i. 188.
Issy, Conference, ii. 285.
Italian Question, ii. 402.
Ithacius of Ossonuba, i. 171.
Ivo of Chartres, ii. 48.
Ixkuell (*see* Y.).

JABLONSKY, W., i. 25; in Berlin, ii. 271.
Jacobins, ii. 335.
Jacobites, i. 187; ii. 95.
Jagello, i. 320.
Jamblichus, i. 64.
James, of Aragon, ii. 63; (I.) of England, ii. 200, 203; (II.), ii. 206; of Scotland (V., VI.), i. 202 sq.
Jansenism, ii. 278 sqq.
Jansenius of Ypern, ii. 278.
Japanese Martyrs, ii. 404.
Jeremias, Pt. of Constantinople, ii. 290 sq.
Jerome, St., i. 140 sq., 156 sq., 187; of Prague, ii. 112 sq.; of Salzburg, ii. 254.
Jerusalem, Anglo-Prussian Bishopric, ii. 334; destroyed, i. 47; Julian's attempt to rebuild the city, i. 122; conquered by the Crusaders and by the Saracens, i. 313; Patriarchate, i. 137; Synod, i. 175.
Jesuates, Order, ii. 63.
Jesuits, Order, founded, ii. 234; suppressed, ii. 303 sq.
Jesumi, ii. 139.
Joachim of Floris, ii. 70.
Joasaph, Pt. of Constantinople, ii. 289.
Jogues, ii. 150.
Johanna, d'Albret, ii. 185; of Arc, ii. 129; of Naples, ii. 24 sq.; pretended female Pope, i. 258.
John and John Frederic of Saxony, i. 165, 171, 174.
John, Pope (I.), i. 146, 222; (II.), i. 146, 186; (III., IV.), i. 147, 193, 196; (VIII.), i. 256, 297 sq.; (IX.), i. 258; (X.), i. 260; (XI.), i. 260; (XII.), i. 261; (XIII.), i. 262; (XIV.), i. 263; (XV.), i. 263, 276; (XVI.), i. 263; (XXI.), i. 356 sq.; (XXII.), ii. 16 sqq.; (XXIII.), ii. 29.
John, Pt. of Antioch, i. 179 sq.; Baliol, ii. 15; of the Cross, ii. 232, 240; of Damascus, i. 292, ii. 76; the Faster, i. 138; of God, ii. 239; Grammaticus, i. 293; Lackland, i. 347; of Matha, ii. 64; of Meda, ii. 64; of Monte Corvino, i. 316; of Oliva, ii. 70; Palæologus (V.), ii. 94; of Ragusa, ii. 94; of Samosata, i. 172; Scholasticus, i. 150; Tolomei, ii. 62; of Vincenza, ii. 129.
John Prester, i. 316.
Jolly, ii. 363.
Jonas, Bp. of Orleans, i. 295.
Jordanus, ii. 129.
Joseph, Emperor (I.), ii. 248; (II.), ii. 251 sq.; Pt. of Constantinople, i. 94.
Josephinism, ii. 251 sq.
Josephus, Flavius, i. 38.
Jouen, ii. 331.
Journalism, ii. 412.
Jovian, Emperor, i. 123.
Jovinian, i. 208, 212.
Jowett, ii. 419.
Juan d'Austria, ii. 193.
Juarez, ii. 328.
Jubilee, ii. 121.
Judaizing heresies, i. 89.
Judicatum of Pope Vigilius, i. 189.
Juliana of Liege, ii. 119.
Julian, the Apostate, i. 121 sq.; of Halicarnassus, i. 186; Presbyter, i. 119; of Toledo, i. 285.
Julius, Pope (I.), i. 143, 165; (II.), ii. 45; (III.), ii. 227, 240.
Juniper Serra, ii. 148.
Jus, canonicum, ii. 54; reformandi, ii. 222; spolii, ii. 270.
Justin, Emperor (I.), i. 185; the Martyr, i. 67, 83, 107.
Justina, Empress, i. 171; of Padua, ii. 72.
Justinian, Emperor (I.), i. 126, 136, 147, 185, 188; (II.), i. 194 sq.
Justus, Bp. of Rochester, i. 228.
Juvavia, i. 232.
Juvenalis, i. 137, 184.

KAHNIS, ii. 414.
Kainites (Cainites), i. 93.
Katerkamp, i. 23.
Kaulbach, ii. 427.
Kaunitz, ii. 251 sq.
Keble, ii. 395.
Keller, Bishop, ii. 352.
Kelly, Patrick, ii. 314; Thomas, ii. 391.
Kenrick, F. P., ii. 315; P. R., ii. 318.
Kent, i. 227.
Kerz, i. 23.
Ketteler, Bp. of Mentz, ii. 363.
Kettler, Gotthard, ii. 216.
Kiew, Bishopric, i. 246.
Kildare, i. 225.
Kilian, St., i. 233.
Kirk, ii. 394.
Kiss of peace, i. 107, 201.
Klee, ii. 346.
Klein, i. 23.
Klesel, ii. 233.
Kliefoth, ii. 414.
Knights, Orders, ii. 56 sqq.
Knoblecher, ii. 330.
Know-Nothings, ii. 322.
Knox, John, ii. 202.
Knud (Canute), i. 241.
Koehler, i. 25; ii. 301.
Kopiati, i. 138.
Koran, i. 248.
Kranach, Lucas, ii. 162.
Kublai, i. 316.
Kuehn, ii. 148.
Kuenzer, ii. 352.
Kuhn, ii. 410.
Kupelian, ii. 332.
Kurz, i. 25.

Digitized by Google

LACHAT, ii. 379.
La Combe, ii. 285.
Lacordaire, ii. 367.
Lactantius, i. 89, 127.
Ladenberg, ii. 359.
Laderchi, James, i. 22.
Ladislaus, of Naples, ii. 28 sq.; of Poland, ii. 216; St., i. 246.
Lainez, ii. 184.
Laity, i. 67 sq.; chalice for the, ii. 115 sq., 231.
Lambert, of Avignon, ii. 164; Emperor, i. 257; Monk, i. 291.
Lambruschini, ii. 386, 401.
Lamennais, De, ii. 367, 409.
Lando, Pope, i. 260.
Landpert, i. 232.
Landulph, i. 282.
Lanfranc of Canterbury, i. 291; ii. 76.
Langenstein, i. 53.
Langton, Stephen, i. 347.
Lanigan, ii. 394.
Lapland, i. 320.
Lapsi, i. 110.
La Salette, ii. 428.
Läsare, ii. 418.
Laski, ii. 216.
Lasso Orlando, ii. 309.
Lateau, Louise, ii. 428.
Lateran Synods, i. 331, 333, 334, 339, 349.
Latimer, ii. 198.
Latitudinarians, ii. 269.
Laurent, ii. 384.
Laurentius, of Canterbury, i. 228; St., i. 58.
Laval, ii. 153, 327.
La Valette, ii. 304 sq.
Lay-abbots, i. 268.
Lazarists, ii. 238.
Lazarus, Bishop, i. 175.
League, Holy, ii. 170, 220; Lombard, i. 339.
Leander of Seville, i. 285.
Lebuin, i. 237.
Lectors, i. 72.
Leely, ii. 420.
Legates a latere, i. 276.
Legend, Golden, ii. 125.
Legio fulminatrix, i. 56.
Legislation, influenced by Christianity, i. 128 sq.
Leibnitz, ii. 287.
Leidrad, i. 300.
Leif, i. 242.
Leipsic, disputation, ii. 157; Interim, ii. 175.
Lejeune, ii. 259.
Lennig, A. F., ii. 356.
Leo, Pope (I.), i. 144, 159, 182 sq., 221; (II.), i. 194 sq.; (III.), i. 252 sq.; (IV.), i. 255; (V.), i. 259; (VI.), i. 260; (VII.), i. 260; (VIII.), i. 262; (IX.), i. 265, 280; (X.), ii. 154; (XI.), ii. 242; (XII.), ii. 400; (XIII.), i. 404 sqq.
Leo, of Achrida, i. 298; Emperor (I.), i. 184; the Isaurian, i. 291 sq.; (VI.), i. 298.
Leonardo da Vinci, ii. 123.
Leonidas, i. 57.
Leonists, ii. 102.
Leontius, Monk, i. 188.
Leopold, II. of Tuscany, i. 254 sq.; Emperor (II.), ii. 219, 286.
Leovigild, i. 219.
Leporius, i. 178.
Lerins, i. 286.
Lessing, ii. 298.
Lessius, ii. 277.
Lesson-books, i. 202.
Lettis, i. 319.
Leu, Joseph, ii. 377.
Leutizians, i. 317.
Lex Julia, etc., i. 129.
Libanius, i. 121.
Libellatics, i. 76.
Libelli, i. 110.
Liberius, i. 161, 166, 168.
Licinius, i. 60, 119.
Light, Friends of, ii. 417.
Liguori, St. Alphonsus, ii. 238, 411.
Lilly, ii. 93.
Lindanus, ii. 257.
Lindisfarne, i. 229.
Lindner, i. 25.
Lingard, John, ii. 394.
Linus, Pope, i. 78.
Lioba, St., i. 236.
Lippomano, ii. 232.
Lisco, ii. 423.
Litanies, i. 211.
Lithuania, i. 318.
Liturgical vestments, i. 207 sq.
Liturgies, ii. 119; Clementine, i. 108; various, i. 200.
Liturgy-book, i. 202 sq.
Livin, St., 233.
Livonia, i. 318.
Llorente, ii. 106.
Locherer, i. 23.
Locke, i. 292.
Löhe, ii. 414.
Lollards, ii. 111.
Lombards, i. 222.
Lombardus, Peter, ii. 97.
Loos, Cornelius, ii. 127.
Lope de Vega, ii. 309.
Loreto, ii. 125.
Lothaire, Emperor, i. 254; of Lorraine, i. 255, 276; of Saxony, i. 333.
Louis, the Mild, i. 254, 287; (II.), i. 255; (VII.), i. 313; (IX.), i. 315; (XIV.), ii. 191, 244; (XV.), ii. 305; (XVI.), ii. 192, 334 sq.; (XVIII.), ii. 365; Bertrand, St., ii. 145; of Condé, ii. 183; de Ponte, ii. 258; of Provence, i. 258.
Louvain, ii. 382.
Louvois, ii. 191.
Lucaris, Cyril, ii. 289.
Lucas, Frederic, ii. 394.
Lucian, of Antioch, i. 152; of Samosata, i. 63.
Lucidus, Presbyter, i. 178.
Lucifer of Calaris, i. 167 sq.
Luciferian Schism, i. 169 sq.
Lucilla, i. 159.
Lucius, Pope (I.), i. 79; (II.), i. 334; (III.), i. 334, ii. 102, 104.
Ludgerus, Bishop, i. 239.
Ludmilla, i. 243.
Luitprant, of Cremona, i. 259 sq., 290; King, i. 251.
Lullus, Archbp. of Mentz, i. 236.
Lunéville, Peace, ii. 342.
Lupold of Bebenburg, ii. 21.
Lupus, i. 301.
Luther, i. 154 sqq., 260 sqq.
Lutherans, ii. 414, 416.
Luxeuil, i. 224.
Lydda, Synod, i. 175.
Lyons, i. 56; Council, i. 352, 355; Poor of, ii. 102; Society, ii. 310.
Lyons, William, ii. 293.
Lyra, N., ii. 88.

MACARIUS of Antioch, i. 194.
Macaulay, ii. 394.
Macedonius and his sect, i. 170 sqq.
Maceta, ii. 145.
Machiavelli, ii. 92.
Mack, ii. 352.
Macrian, i. 58.
Madeville, ii. 293.
Magdeburg, ii. 221.
Magna Charta libertatis, i. 348.
Magnentius, i. 166.
Magnus, Albert, ii 80; of Füssen, i. 232.
Maguire, ii. 397.
Magyars, i. 246.
Mahomet, i. 247 sqq.
Mai, Angelo, ii. 401.
Maidalchini, Olympia, ii. 244.
Maigro, ii. 138.
Mainotti, i. 245.
Maistre, De, ii. 366.
Major, George, ii. 265.
Majorian Conflict, ii. 265.
Majorinus of Carthage, i. 160.
Malabar Customs, ii. 136.
Malchion, Presbyter, i. 96
Maldonat, ii. 257, 412.
Malon, ii. 383.

Digitized by Google

Mamachi, ii. 259.
Mamertus of Vienne, i. 211.
Manes, i. 94.
Manfred, i. 354 sq.
Manicheans, i. 94 sq.
Manning, Cardinal, ii. 398.
Mantua, Synod, ii. 226.
Map, Walter, ii. 85.
Maranos, ii. 105.
Marca, Peter de, ii. 246.
Marcellinus, Pope, i. 78.
Marcellus of Ancyra, i. 165 sq.
Marcellus, Pope (I.), i. 78; (II.), ii. 228.
Marcia, i. 56.
Marcion, Gnostic, i. 94.
Marcus, of Arethusa, i. 168; Aurelius, Emperor, i. 56; Gnostic, i. 93.
Marcus, Pope, i. 143.
Maréchal, ii. 314.
Margaret, of Parma, ii. 192 sq.; von der Saal, ii. 170; de Valois, ii. 182, 187.
Marian Priests, ii. 331.
Maria Theresa, ii. 250 sq.
Marilley, ii. 378.
Marinus, Pope (I.), i. 256; (II.), i. 260.
Maris, Bp. of Hardashir, i. 181.
Marius Mercator, i. 176.
Mark of Nice, ii. 147.
Marmoutier, i. 214; ii. 76.
Maronites, ii. 95, 291.
Marozia, i. 258 sq.
Marquette, ii. 152.
Marriage, clandestine, ii. 121, 230.
Marsilius, Ficinus, ii. 91; of Padua, ii. 18.
Martialis, Libellatic, i. 76.
Martin of Tours, i. 172, 213.
Martini, ii. 138.
Martyrius of Antioch, i. 184.
Martyrologies, i. 307.
Martyr, Peter Vermilio, ii. 184.
Martyrs, i. 61.
Maruthas, i. 117.
Mary, Blessed Virgin, i. 34, 47; feasts in her honor, i. 209, ii. 125; Sodality, ii. 330.
Mary, of England, ii. 198 sq.; Stuart, ii. 199, 202.
Massalians, i. 212.
Massilians, i. 176.
Massillon, ii. 259.
Mathurins, ii. 64.
Matilda of Tuscany, i. 325, 330, 332.
Matrimony, i. 111.
Matter, i. 25.
Matthew, ii. 391.
Maur, St., i. 283; Congregation, ii. 240, 259.
Maurevert, ii. 188.
Maurice, of Orange, ii. 194, 269; of Saxony, ii. 174 sq.
Mauritius Burdinus, i. 332.
Maxentius, i. 60.
Maximian Herculius, i. 58.
Maximilian, of Bavaria, ii. 220; Emperor, ii. 155 sq.; Frederic, Archbishop, ii. 253; of Mexico, ii. 328; St., i. 51.
Maximinus, Daja, i. 60; Thrax, i. 57.
Maximus, Abbot of Constantinople, i. 193; Theurgist, i. 121; usurper, i. 156, 172.
Mayence (Mentz), i. 50, 236.
May-laws, ii. 359 sq.
McCabe, ii. 393.
McCloskey, ii. 318 sq.
McHale, ii. 341 sq.
Mechtildis, Sts., ii. 87.
Médicis, Catherine de, ii. 188 sq.
Meindarts, ii. 284.
Meinhard, i. 318.
Meinwerk, i. 290.
Melanchthon, ii. 156 sq., 206.
Melchiades, Pope, i. 80.
Melchites, i. 186.
Meletian Schism, of Antioch, i. 169; of Egypt, i. 161 sq.
Meletius of Lycopolis, i. 161.
Melito, Apologist, i. 67.
Mellitus, Bp. of London, i. 228.
Memnon, Bp. of Ephesus, i. 180.
Menander, i. 90.
Mendicants, ii. 65 sqq.
Mennas, Pt. of Constantinople, i. 188 sq.
Mennonites, ii. 269.
Mensurius, Bp. of Carthage, i. 159.
Mermillod, ii. 378.
Mesrop, i. 118.
Methodists, ii. 272 sq.
Methodius, of Constantinople, i. 294; Monk, i. 243; of Tyre, i. 187.
Metropolitans, i. 72 sq., 136 sq.
Metternich, ii. 351.
Mettrie, De la, ii. 296.
Metz, singing-school, i. 287.
Mezzofanti, ii. 401.
Michael, Angelo, ii. 123; Cerularius, i. 298; of Cesena, ii. 18; Emperor (I., II.), i. 293; (III.), i. 295; St., i. 209.
Michaelis, ii. 297.
Miezislaw, i. 244.
Miguel, Infant, ii. 373.
Milan, Edict, i. 60.
Mileve, Synod, i. 176.
Militia Christi, ii. 67.
Milner, ii. 394.
Miltitz, ii. 156.
Minims, ii. 65.
Minorites, ii. 65 sq.
Minutius Felix, i. 67, 88.
Mirabeau, ii. 335.
Misopogon, i. 125.
Missa, i. 200.
Missale, i. 202.
Missaticum, i. 270.
Missi Dominici, i. 269.
Mitre, i. 208.
Moehler, i. 23; ii. 346.
Molanus, ii. 286.
Molay, James, ii. 59.
Molina, ii. 277.
Molinus, ii. 284.
Molyneux, ii. 313.
Momiers, ii. 421.
Monarchia Sicula (*see* Sicilian).
Monarchians, i. 97.
Monasticism, i. 213.
Mongus, Peter, i. 184 sq.
Monica, St., i. 157.
Monita secreta of the Jesuits, ii. 237.
Mönnichhausen, ii. 216.
Monophysites, i. 181 sq.; ii. 140.
Monothelites, i. 191 sq.
Montalembert, ii. 367 sq.
Montanus, i. 98.
Monte Casino, i. 282.
Montesquieu, ii. 295.
Montgelas, ii. 344.
Montlosier, ii. 366.
Moore, Thomas, ii. 391.
Morales, ii. 138, 309.
Moralists, ii. 411.
Moravian Brethren, ii. 271.
Moreno, Bishop, ii. 319; President, ii. 329.
More, Thomas, ii. 195.
Morgan, ii. 293.
Moriscoes, ii. 105.
Mörl, Mary, ii. 428.
Morlin, Joachim, ii. 265.
Mormons, ii. 421.
Morone, ii. 240.
Mosheim, i. 24.
Moymir, i. 243.
Mühlberg, battle, ii. 174 sq.
Muenscher, i. 25.
Mulieres subintroductae (spiritual sisters), i. 135.
Münzer, Thomas, ii. 160.
Muratori, ii. 259.
Murillo, ii. 309.
Mutian, ii. 92.
Mysticism, ii. 75, 84, 86; Protestant, ii. 270.

NAKATENUS, ii. 260.
Nantes, edict, ii. 191.
Naples, ecclesiastical affairs, ii. 375.

Digitized by Google

Napoleon (I.), ii. 337 sq.; (III.), ii. 368 sq.
Narses, i. 222.
Narvaez, ii. 372.
Natalis, Alexander, i. 22; Confessor, i. 96; Hervæus, ii. 82.
National Assembly, French, ii. 335.
Nausea, ii. 257.
Nazarenes, i. 89.
Neale, ii. 313.
Neander, i. 24.
Nectarius, Pt. of Constantinople, i. 203.
Nefried of Narbonne, i. 300.
Neo-Platonism, i. 63 sq., 127 sq.
Neri, St. Philip, ii. 232, 238.
Nerincks, ii. 314.
Nero, Emperor, i. 48, 54.
Nerva, Emperor, i. 55.
Nestorius, i. 178 sqq.
Netherlands, ii. 192.
Neuma, i. 206.
Neumann, ii. 320.
New Corvey, i. 239.
Newman, ii. 396 sq.
Nice, Council (I.), i. 135, 138; (II.), i. 293.
Nicephorus, Emperor, i. 293; Callisti, i. 21.
Nice-Rimini, i. 169.
Nicetas, ii. 93.
Nicholas, Pope (I.), i. 255, 276 sq., 296; (II.), i. 265, 281; (III.), i. 357; (V.), ii. 95.
Nicholas, of Clemange, ii. 26, 86; of Cusa, ii. 34, 38, 89; of Flüe, ii. 130; of Lyra, ii. 88.
Nicolai, ii. 299.
Nicolaitanes, i. 89.
Nicole, ii. 258, 279.
Niem, Theodore, ii. 24.
Nieremberg, ii. 258.
Niketas, Pectoratus, i. 298.
Ninian, St., i. 226.
Ninians, i. 226.
Niobites, i. 186.
Nisibis, School, i. 152.
Nitzsch, ii. 414, 416.
Noailles, Cardinal, ii. 281.
Nobili, ii. 136.
Nobrega, ii. 144.
Noëtus, i. 97.
Nogaret, i. 363; ii. 14.
Nolasci, ii. 63.
Nominalism, ii. 77.
Nomocanon, i. 150, 299.
Nonconformists, ii. 199.
Nonnus, Monk, i. 188.
Norbert, Capuchin, ii. 140; St., ii. 61, 98.
Nördlingen, battle, ii. 222.
Noricum, i. 50.
Normans, James of, i. 361.
Northcote, ii. 397.
Notaries, i. 132.
Noting of Verona, i. 301.
Notker, Balbulus, i. 288; Labeo, i. 289; Physicus, i. 289.
Novatian, i. 111.
Novatus of Carthage, i. 111.
Novgorod, Bishopric, i. 246.
Nubia, i. 119.
Nunciatures, ii. 241, 253.
Nunia, i. 118.
Nuremberg, Diet, ii. 161.

OATES, ii. 206.
Oblates, of St. Ambrose, ii. 238; of Francisca Romana, ii. 63.
Obotrites, i. 317 sq.
Occam (*see* William).
Ochino, ii. 236.
O'Connell, ii. 398 sq.
Odoacer, i. 144, 217, 222.
Odo of Clugny, St., i. 260.
Œcolampadius, ii. 177.
Œcumenical Councils, i. 149.
Officials, ii. 55.
Officium B. M. V., i. 307.
Offroy de la Mettrie, ii. 296.
O'Hagan, ii. 391.
Olaf, St., i. 242; Skotkonung, i. 241; Trygvesen, i. 242.
Olahus, ii. 218.
Old Catholics, ii. 407.
Olier, ii. 258.
Olivetans, ii. 162.
Olmutz, i. 243.
Ὅμνιος, ὁμοιούσιος, ὁμοούσιος, i. 167 sqq.
Ophites, i. 93.
Optatus, i. 161.
Orange, Council, i. 177.
Orarion, i. 207.
Oratorians, ii. 238.
Ordeals, i. 310.
Ordericus Vitalis, i. 21.
Ordinationes absolutae, i. 271.
Organ, i. 305; ii. 177.
Organic Articles, ii. 339.
Origen, i. 67, 86 sq.
Orlando di Lasso, ii. 309.
Orosius, i. 20, 127, 175.
Orsi, i. 22.
Orthodoxy, feast, i. 307.
Osiander, ii. 265.
Ostiarii (janitors), i. 72.
Ostrogoths, i. 218 sq.
Oswald, Bp. of Worcester, i. 278; King, i. 229.
Oswy, King, i. 229 sq.
Otfried of Weissenburg, i. 288.
Othlo, i. 290.
Otho, Emperor (I.), i. 241, 260; (II.), i. 262; (III.), i. 263; (IV.), i. 386; St., i. 317.
Oxenstiern, ii. 222.
Oxford, ii. 395.

PACCA, Cardinal, ii. 254.
Pachomius, i. 213.
Pack, Otho, ii. 165.
Pactum Calixtinum, i. 332.
Pagi, Anthony, i. 21.
Painters, ii. 123, 427.
Palafox, ii. 145.
Palestrina, ii. 307.
Palladius, i. 224.
Pallavicini, ii. 226.
Pallium, i. 142.
Palma, i. 22.
Palm Sunday, i. 211.
Palmer, ii. 396.
Pamphilus, i. 187.
Pandulph, i. 348.
Pannonia, i. 50.
Pantænus, i. 85.
Papal election, i. 265 sq., 356; ii. 28, 31, 243.
Paphnutius, i. 135.
Papias, i. 46, 82, 99.
Parabolani, i. 132.
Paracelsus, ii. 270.
Paræus, ii. 286.
Pardulus, i. 301.
Paris, Congress, ii. 402; Francis de, ii. 282; University, ii. 73.
Parker, ii. 201.
Parmenian, i. 161.
Pascal, ii. 279; Pope (I.), i. 254; (II.), i. 331.
Paschasius, Quesnel, ii. 281 sq.; Radbertus, i. 288, 302.
Passagians, ii. 99.
Passau, Treaty, ii. 175.
Passionists, ii. 238.
Pataria, i. 281.
Paten, i. 208.
Paternus, St., i. 227.
Patriarchs, i. 137.
Patricius, St., i. 224 sq.
Patripassionists, i. 97.
Patristic literature, i. 151.
Patronage, i. 131, 271.
Paulicians, i. 171 sq.; ii. 95, 99.
Paulinus, of Aquileia, i. 286; of Treves, i. 167; of York, i. 228.
Paul, Pope (II.), ii. 41; (III.), ii. 196, 226, 232; (IV.), i. 228 sq., 240; (V.), ii. 242, 278.
Paulus, Apostle, i. 40 sq.; of the Cross, ii. 238; Diaconus, i. 286; of Emesa, i. 180; of Samosata, i. 96, 172; of Thebes, i. 116.
Pavia, Synod, i. 264; Pseudo-Synod, i. 338.
Pazmann, ii. 218.
Peada, King, i. 229.

Digitized by Google

Peasants' War, ii. 162.
Pedro, ii. 373.
Peel, Robert, ii. 390.
Pehem, ii. 251.
Pelagianism, i. 172 sq.
Pelagius, Pope (I.), i. 147, 190; (II.), i. 138, 190.
Pelagius, Apocrisiarius, i. 188; Monk, i. 172 sq.
Pelbart, ii. 129.
Pella, i. 48.
Pellicia, ii. 259.
Pellison, ii. 288.
Penance, sacrament, i. 108 sq.
Penda, King, i. 229.
Penitential books, i. 203 sq; discipline, i. 108 sq.
Penitentiaries, ii. 55.
Penn, ii. 149, 274.
Pentecost, i. 112.
Pepin, i. 249 sq.
Pepuzians, i. 98.
Peraldus, ii. 89.
Percy, ii. 108.
Peregrinus Proteus, i. 63.
Periarchon (On First Principles), i. 87, 187.
Perpetua, St., i. 57.
Perpignan, ii. 27.
Perron, Du, ii. 257.
Persecution, of Christians, i. 54 sq.; of Jews, i. 321.
Persia, i. 117.
Per Venerabilem, Decretal, ii. 49.
Petavius, ii. 257.
Peter, d'Ailly, ii. 26, 86; of Aragon, ii. 102; Aureolus, ii. 85; of Bruys, ii. 98; of Castelnau, ii. 101; Flotte, i. 361; the Great, of Russia, ii. 290; the Hermit, i. 312; of Limoges, ii. 60; de Luna, ii. 23; of Murrone, ii. 61; Nolascus, ii. 63; de Palude, ii. 18; of Pisa, i. 286; de Vinea, i. 351; Waldus, ii. 102.
Peterson, ii. 213.
Peter's pence, ii. 51.
Petit, ii. 237.
Petrarca, ii. 90.
Petrobrusians, ii. 98.
Petrus, Apostle, i. 44 sq., 50; of Constantinople, i. 194.
Peucer, ii. 266.
Pfaff, ii. 286.
Pfefferkorn, ii. 155.
Pflug, Julius, ii. 171.
Phantasiasts, i. 186.
Pharisees, i. 30.
Philip, Arabs, i. 57; August, of France, i. 318, 348; the Fair, i. 359 sq.; of Hesse, i. 164 sq., 170; of Spain (II.), ii. 106, 192 sq., 231.
Philippists, ii. 266.
Phillips, ii. 346.
Philo, i. 31.
Philopatris, i. 125.
Philoponus, i. 186.
Philosophumena, i. 87.
Philostorgius, i. 20.
Philostratus, i. 64.
Philoxenus, i. 185.
Photinus, of Sirmium, i. 166.
Photius, of Constantinople, i. 295 sq.
Physiocrats, ii. 296.
Piacenza, Synod, i. 312.
Piarists, ii. 239.
Picpus, Congregation, ii. 331.
Picts, i. 226.
Piedmontese, ii. 407.
Pietism, ii. 270.
Pilgrim of Passau, i. 246.
Pilgrimages, i. 208.
Pirminius, St., i. 232.
Pisa, Synod, ii. 28 sq.
Pistoja, Synod, ii. 255.
Pistus, i. 165.
Pithon, ii 246.
Pitt, ii. 308.
Pius, Pope (I.), i. 78; (II.), ii. 41; (III.), ii. 45; (IV.), ii. 228 sq., 240; (V.), i. 240; (VI.), i. 251 sq.; (VII.), ii. 400; (VIII.), ii. 400; (IX.), ii. 401 sq.
Pizarro, ii. 143.
Placidus, St., i. 283.
Planck, i. 24.
Platina, ii. 41.
Plato, i. 32.
Plenaries, ii. 128.
Plettenburg, ii. 215.
Plinius, the Younger, i. 55.
Plotinus, i. 64.
Plymouth Brethren, ii. 421.
Pneumatics, i. 91.
Pneumatomachoi, i. 170.
Poetry, ecclesiastical, i. 207.
Poissy, Religious Conference, ii. 184.
Pole, Cardinal, ii. 198, 201, 227, 232.
Polemics of the Pagans, i. 62 sq., 124 sq.
Polignac, ii. 366.
Polo, Marco, i. 316.
Poltrot de Méré, ii. 186.
Polycarp, St., i. 82, 113.
Polycrates of Ephesus, i. 113.
Polyglot, Complutensian, ii. 88.
Pombal, ii. 144, 303.
Pompadour, ii. 296.
Pomponatus, ii. 91.
Pons Milvius, battle, i. 60.
Pontianus, i. 79.
Pontifex Maximus, i. 120, 123; ii. 133.
Poor Clares, ii. 66.
Poor Man's Bible, ii. 128
Poor of Lyons, ii. 102.
Populicans, i. 172.
Porphyrius, i. 64.
Portier, ii. 314.
Port Royal, ii. 280.
Positivism, ii. 410.
Possessor, i. 177.
Possevin, ii. 214, 290.
Potamiana, i. 57.
Pothinus, i. 56.
Pourney, ii. 110.
Praedestinatus, i. 177.
Praefatio, i. 201.
Pragmatic Sanction, ii. 39, 245.
Prague, Bishopric, i. 244; Peace, ii. 222.
Praxeas, i. 97 sq.
Preaching, ii. 127.
Predestination, i. 178.
Premonstratensians, ii. 61.
Presbyterians, ii. 199, 203, 205, 418, 420.
Prierias, Sylvester, ii. 156.
Priests, distinguished from bishops, i. 67 sq.
Primacy of the Roman bishop, i. 73 sq., 139 sq., 275 sq.
Priscillian, i. 171 sq.
Private Oratories, i. 271.
Privatus, i. 75.
Privilegium Fori, i. 243, 342; of Henry V., 331.
Probabilismus, ii. 258.
Processions, i. 211; on St. Mark's Day, i. 211.
Proclus, i. 126.
Procope, ii. 115.
Prodicians, i. 93.
Profession of Faith, Tridentine, ii. 230.
Propaganda, i. 135.
Proselytes, i. 134.
Prosper of Aquitania, i. 177.
Proterius, Pt. of Alexandria, i. 184.
Protestantism, ii. 166 sq.
Protestants, Free, ii. 413.
Protestant Union, ii. 414 sq.
Protoktistoi, i. 188.
Provincial Synods, i. 149; ii. 229.
Prudentius, i. 207; of Troyes, i. 301.
Pseudo-Clementines, i. 89.
Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals, i. 273.
Psychics, i. 91.
Ptolemæus, de Fiadonibus, i. 21; Gnostic, i. 93, 173.
Publicans, i. 172.
Pugin, ii. 427.
Pulcheria, i. 183.
Purcell, J. B., ii. 315.
Puritans, ii. 194.
Pusey, ii. 396 sq., 419.
Pythagoras, i. 65.

Digitized by Google

QUADRAGESIMA (Lent), i. 114, 209.
Quadratus, Bp. of Athens, i. 67.
Quadrivium, i. 287.
Quaker, ii. 274.
Quarto-decimans, i. 113
Quesnay, ii. 296.
Quesnel, ii. 281 sq.
Quickenborne, ii. 315.
Quiercy, Synod, i. 301 sq
Quietism, ii. 284 sq.
Quin, ii. 391.
Quinisextum, i. 194.
Quirinus, St., i. 51.

RABANUS Maurus, i. 288, 301 sq.
Rabulas, Bp. of Edessa, i. 180.
Racine, Bonaventure, i. 22.
Racow, Catechism, ii. 276.
Radbertus, i. 288, 302.
Radbot, i. 233.
Rahosa, ii. 290.
Rale, ii. 150.
Rance, Bouthillier, ii. 240.
Raoul, ii. 101.
Rapert, i. 288.
Raskolniks, ii. 291.
Rasoherina, ii. 331.
Ratherius, Bp. of Verona, i. 290.
Rationalism, protest, ii. 297.
Ratisbon, i. 232, 234; Alliance, ii. 161; Diet, ii. 172; Interim, ii. 170.
Ratramnus of Corvey, i. 288, 301.
Rauscher, i. 23.
Rautenstrauch, ii. 251, 300.
Ravaillac, ii. 236.
Raymond (VI., VII.), ii. 101, 102; Lullus, ii. 83; of Pennaforte, ii. 63, 89; of Sabunde, ii. 86.
Raynaldus, i. 21.
Rayneval, ii. 403.
Realism, ii. 77.
Reccared, i. 219, 285.
Receveur, i. 22.
Rechberger, ii. 354.
Redemptorists, ii. 238.
Reflections, moral, ii. 281.
Reformers, ii. 260 sq.
Regalia, ii. 244.
Reginald, i. 347.
Regino, Abbot, i. 289.
Reichenau, Abbey, i. 232.
Reichlin-Meldegg, i. 23; ii. 352.
Reiffenstuel, ii. 259.
Reinal of Dassel, i. 337 sq.
Reinbern, i. 317.
Reinkens, ii. 424.
Reisach, Cardinal, ii. 362.
Relics, veneration, i. 115, 210.
Rembert, i. 240.
Remigius, of Auxerre, i. 223, 290; of Lyons, i. 302.
Remoboth, i. 214.
Remonstrance of Arminians, ii. 268.
Renan, ii. 410.
Renata, ii. 219.
Renaudie, De la, ii. 183.
Requesens, ii. 193.
Reservatum ecclesiasticum, ii. 176, 222.
Residence, duty, ii. 229.
Restitution, Edict, ii. 221.
Reuchlin, ii. 88, 92, 155.
Rhætia, i. 50.
Rheims, English Seminary, i. 200.
Rhense, Diet, ii. 20 sq.
Rhetoricians, i. 212.
Rhinocorura, School, i. 152.
Rhynsburger (*see* Collegiants).
Ricci, Lorenzo, ii. 306; Matteo, ii. 137; Scipio, ii. 255.
Richard, of Cornwall, i. 356 sq.; the Lion Heart, i. 313; of St. Victor, ii. 84.
Richelieu, ii. 191.
Richer, Edmond, ii. 246.
Richter, ii. 415.
Ridley, ii. 197.
Rienzi, Cola di, ii. 22.
Riffel, ii. 352.
Riga, i. 319.
Rimini, Synod, i. 168; Madonna, ii. 428.
Ring and crosier, i. 208, 269.
Ritter, historian, i. 23.
Ritualists, ii. 419.
Rituals, i. 306.
Robber Synod, i. 183.
Robbia, Luca della, ii. 124.
Robert, of Abrissel, ii. 62; of Geneva, ii. 23; Guiscard, i. 266, 327; of Melun, i. 266, 327; of Naples, ii. 15; Pulleyne, ii. 79; of Sorbonne, ii. 74.
Rodoald, i. 296.
Rodriguez, ii. 258.
Rogations, i. 21.
Roger, Bacon, ii. 83; of Normandy, i. 330.
Rohrbacher, i. 22.
Rokyczana, ii. 115.
Roland, i. 325, 337.
Romanus, Pope, i. 258.
Romuald, St., i. 284.
Roncaglia, i. 337.
Ronge, ii. 423 sq.
Rosa, St., ii. 144.
Rosary, i. 307.
Rosati, ii. 314.
Roscelin, ii. 77.
Rosicrucians, ii. 270.
Rossi, Minister, ii. 402.
Roswitha, i. 289.
Rothad of Soisson, i. 276.
Rothe, ii. 414.
Rousseau, ii. 296.
Roverella, ii. 341.
Royko, i. 23.
Rüdigier, Bp. of Linz, ii. 358.
Rudolph, of Hapsburg, i. 356; of Suabia, i. 326.
Ruegen, i. 318.
Rufinus of Aquileia, i 157, 187.
Rule of Faith, i. 99.
Rupert, of Deutz, ii. 85, 88, of Worms, i. 232.
Rupp, ii. 417.
Rural bishops, i. 72; chapters, i. 272.
Russian Church, ii. 289, 425.
Ruttenstock, i. 23.
Ruysbroek, ii. 87.
Ryswick, Clause, ii. 222.

SABAITES, i. 188.
Sabas, St., i. 188.
Sabeans, i. 118.
Sabellius, i. 97.
Sabereth of Essex, i. 228.
Sabeti, ii. 411.
Sabinian, Pope, i. 147.
Sacarelli, i. 22.
Sachoni, ii. 100.
Sacramentarium, i. 202; Gregorianum, i. 204.
Sacraments, controversy on, ii. 160, 166.
Sacred Heart, of Jesus, ii. 307, 426; of Mary, ii. 330.
Sacrilege, law on, ii. 366.
Sadducees, i. 30.
Sadolet, ii. 232.
Sailer, ii. 411.
Saisette, Bp. of Pamiers, i. 360.
Saladin, i. 313.
Saldanha, ii. 303.
Sales, St. Francis, ii. 233, 239.
Salisbury, J., ii. 84.
Salle, J. B. de la, ii. 239.
Salmeron, Alphonsus, ii. 257.
Salvatierra, ii. 148.
Salvation Army, ii. 422.
Salvianus, Bishop, i. 171; Presbyter, i. 128.
Salza, James, ii. 217.
Salzburg, i. 235; emigration from, ii. 286.
Salzmann, ii. 325.
Samaritans, i. 31.
Samson, Bernhardin, ii. 176.
San benito, ii. 106.
Sancho (I.), i. 348.
Sandoval, ii. 144.
Sanzio, ii. 123.
Sapienza at Rome, ii. 364.
Sarabaites, i. 214.
Saragossa, Synod, i. 171.
Sarbiewski, ii. 309.

Digitized by Google

Sardica, Council, i. 142, 166.
Sarpi, Paul, ii. 243.
Sarzana, ii. 39.
Saturday, i. 114.
Saturninus, Gnostic, i. 93.
Savonarola, ii. 129, 132.
Sbinko, ii. 111.
Scepticism, ii. 292 sq.
Schaezler, ii. 410.
Schaff, i. 25.
Schall, Adam, ii. 138.
Schapur, ii. 117.
Schelling, ii. 408, 413.
Schenkel, ii. 413.
Schiller, ii. 298.
Schlegel, ii. 354.
Schleiermacher, i. 25; ii. 413.
Schmalfuss, i. 23.
Schmalkald, Articles, ii. 169; League, ii. 168; war, ii. 174.
Schmidt, i. 24.
Schneider, Eulogius, ii. 301.
Schola Palatina, i. 286.
Scholasticism, ii. 75 sqq., 85.
Schools, cathedral and cloister, i. 286 sq.
Schönborn, ii. 286.
Schreiber, ii. 352.
Schrökh, i. 24.
Schulte, ii. 407.
Schwabach, Articles, ii. 166.
Schwarz in Gotha, ii. 417.
Schwenkfeld, ii. 217, 270.
Sciarra Colonna, i. 363.
Scotists, ii. 82, 125.
Scotus Erigena, i. 289, 301; ii. 76.
Scupoli, ii. 258.
Scythian Monks, i. 186.
Secretarium, i. 206.
Sects, teaching false mysticism, ii. 417.
Secularization, ii. 342.
Secundus, Gnostic, i. 93; of Tigisis, i. 159.
Sedlnitzki, ii. 349.
Sedulius, i. 207.
Segarelli, ii. 98.
Seghers, ii. 324.
Segneri, ii. 259.
Seleucia-Ctesiphon, i. 117.
Seleucia, Synod, i. 168.
Selvaggio, ii. 259.
Semgallians, i. 319.
Semi-Arians, i. 166 sq.
Seminaries, i. 133; ii. 229.
Semi-Pelagians, i. 176 sq.
Semler, i. 24; ii. 297.
Sendomir, ii. 216.
Sensualism, ii. 292.
Septimius Severus, Emperor, i. 56.
Septuagint, i. 31.
Serapeion, i. 123.
Sergius, Pope (II.), i. 255; (III.), i. 259; (IV.), i. 263.
Sergius, of Constantinople, i. 191, Monothelite; Schismatic, i. 298.
Seripand, ii. 228.
Servites, ii. 62.
Servus servorum Dei, i. 147.
Sethites, i. 93.
Seton, ii. 313.
Severians, i. 191.
Severin, Pope, i. 147; St., i. 221.
Severus of Antioch, i. 185.
Seymour, ii. 197.
Shaftesbury, ii. 292.
Shiel, ii. 390.
Shrewsbury, ii. 395.
Sicilian, law-books, i. 351; monarchy, ii. 247; Vespers, i. 357.
Sicily, i. 330, 354.
Sickingen, Francis, ii. 158.
Sidonius Apollinaris, i. 219.
Siegwart-Müller, ii. 378.
Siemasko, ii. 386.
Siena, Council, ii. 83 sq.
Sieyès, ii. 335.
Sigeburt, King, i. 229.
Sigismund, Emperor, ii. 34 sq., 116 sq., 216; King of Burgundy, i. 221.
Signaculum sinus, manuum et oris, i. 96.
Silverius, Pope, i. 185.
Simeon the Stylite, i. 180.
Simonetta, ii. 228.
Simon, Magus, i. 89; Metaphrastes, i. 299; de Montfort, ii. 101 sq.
Simony, i. 277, 323.
Simplician, i. 158.
Simplicius, Pope, i. 144, 184.
Singing-schools, i. 206.
Siricius, Pope, i. 135, 141, 143, 172.
Sirmium, Synods and Formulas, i. 166 sq.
Sisinnius, Pt. of Constantinople, i. 298.
Sisters, of the Free Spirit, ii. 99; of Mercy and of the Good Shepherd, ii. 239.
Sixtus, Pope (I.), i. 58; (II.), i. 80; (III.), i. 144, 180; (V.), ii. 241.
Skalholt, Bishopric, i. 242.
Skara, i. 241.
Slavery, i. 129.
Smith, ii. 421.
Socinus, Faustus and Lælius, ii. 262, 276.
Socrates, historian, i. 20; philosopher, i. 32.
Sœurs grises, ii. 239.
Soisson, singing-school, i. 287.
Solidaires, ii. 382.
Somaglia, ii. 400.
Somaschans, ii. 238.
Sonderbund War, ii. 378.
Sophia, St., church at Constantinople, i. 204.
Sophronius, i. 161 sq.
Sorbonne, ii. 74.
Sorcery, ii. 126.
Soter, Pope, i. 78.
Sozomenus, i. 20.
Spalatin, ii. 156.
Spalding, M. J., ii. 320 sq.
Spangenberg, ii. 271.
Spanheim, i. 25.
Spee, Frederic, ii. 127.
Spener, ii. 270.
Spiegel, ii. 349.
Spinola, ii. 286.
Spire, Diets, ii. 165, 166, 169.
Spiritualists, ii. 69 sq.
Spiritual Sisters, i. 135.
Spittler, i. 24.
Sponsors, i. 104.
Stafford, ii. 206.
Stahl, ii. 414.
Stancari, ii. 265.
Ständlin, i. 24.
Stanislaus, Bishop, i. 244.
Stapleton, ii. 257.
Starowierzi, ii. 291.
Station days, i. 114.
Stations, Way of the, i. 307.
Staupitz, ii. 156.
Stefnir, i. 242.
Stenhoven, ii. 283.
Stenkil, i. 241.
Stephen, Pope (I.), i. 75 sq.; (II.), i. 251; (III.), i. 292; (IV.), i. 254; (V.), i. 256; (VII.), i. 257; (VIII.), i. 260; (IX.), i. 265, 281.
Stephen, Cardinal, i. 281; of Constantinople, i. 298; King of Hungary, i. 246; Langton, i. 347; of Tigerno, ii. 60.
Stercorianism, i. 303.
Sticharion, i. 207.
Stilicho, i. 124.
Stock, Simon, ii. 62.
Stolberg, Frederic L., i. 23; ii. 427.
Strafford, ii. 208.
Strauss, David, ii. 413.
Strigel, Victorinus, ii. 266.
Sturm, i. 236.
Stylites, i. 214.
Suarez, ii. 257, 278.
Subdeacons, i. 72.
Suestriones, ii. 99.
Suevi, i. 219.
Suffolk, i. 198.
Suidger of Bamberg, i. 264.
Suitbert, Bishop, i. 239.
Sulpicius Severus, i. 20.
Sunday, i. 111, 309.
Superstition, ii. 126.
Supralapsarians, ii. 264.
Surgant, ii. 127.
Surius, ii. 259.
Surplice-fees, i. 307.

Digitized by Google

Suso, ii. 87.
Sussex, i. 229.
Sutri, Synod, i. 264; Treaty, i. 331.
Swatopluk, i. 243.
Swedenborg, ii. 275.
Swend, i. 241.
Swerker, i. 242, 348.
Swieten, Van, ii. 251.
Sword-bearers, i. 319.
Sydow, ii. 423.
Syllabus, ii. 403.
Sylvester, Pope (I.), i. 80, 143; (II.), i. 263.
Symbol, Apostolic, i. 103; Athanasian, i. 194.
Symbolic Books, Protestant, ii. 260.
Symbolism, ii. 411.
Symeon, Abbot, ii. 96; of Seleucia, i. 117; of Trebisond, ii. 95.
Symmachus, Pope, i. 145, 222.
Symmachus, Senator, i. 123.
Syncelli, i. 132.
Syncretistic Controversy, ii. 268.
Synergistic Controversy, ii. 266.
Synesius of Cyrene, i. 155, 207.
Synnada, Synod, i. 105.
Synod, Holy, ii. 290, 425; Permanent, i. 137, 149.
Syria, Mahometanism in, i. 247.
Syrianus, i. 167.
System, feudal, i. 267.

TABALDESCHI, ii. 23
Tabernacle, ii. 123.
Taborites, ii. 115 sq.
Talavera, i. 321.
Talleyrand, ii. 335 sq.
Talmud, i. 49.
Tamburini, i. 255.
Tanchelm, ii. 98.
Tanner, Adam, ii. 121, 257.
Tanucci, ii. 305.
Tarasius, Pt. of Constantinople, i. 293.
Tatian, i. 67, 83, 94.
Tauler, ii. 87.
Tausen, ii. 215.
Tehgakwita, ii. 151.
Tejada, ii. 328.
Telesphorus, Pope, i. 78.
Teller, ii. 298.
Tellier, Le, ii. 191.
Templars, ii. 14.
Temples, pagan, destroyed, i. 123 sq.
Territorial system, ii. 175.
Tertiaries, ii. 66 sq.
Tertullian, i. 67, 75, 87 sq., 98.
Test Act, ii. 306.
Tetzel, ii. 154.
Teutonic Knights, i. 313.
Teutonicus, John, ii. 54.
Thaddeus of Suessa, i. 353.
Thalia, ii. 163.
Thankbrand, i. 242.
Theatines, ii. 238.
Theban Legion, i. 59.
Thecla, St., i. 236.
Theiner, i. 22; ii. 428.
Themistius, i. 186.
Theoctistus, Bp. of Cæsarea, i. 86.
Theodelinda, i. 223.
Theodo of Bavaria, i. 232.
Theodora, Empress, i. 185; the Elder and the Younger, i. 258.
Theodore, Pope (I.), i. 193; (II.), i. 258.
Theodore, Askidas, i. 188 sq.; of Canterbury, i. 229; the Lector, i. 20; of Mopsuestia, i. 152; Studita, i. 293.
Theodoret of Cyrus, i. 20, 127, 154, 179 sq., 189.
Theodoric, i. 145 sq.; (I.), i. 222; (II.), i. 232.
Theodosians, i. 191.
Theodosius, the Great, i. 123 sq., 156, 170; (II.), i. 130, 179 sq.; Monk, i. 184
Theodotus, the Broker, i. 96; Cassiteras, i. 293; the Tanner, i. 96.
Theodulph, Bp. of Orleans, i. 287.
Theopaschites, i. 186.
Theophanes, i. 207.
Theophilanthropists, ii. 337.
Theophilus, of Alexandria, i. 154, 187; Apologist, i. 67, 83; of Diu, i. 118.
Theophylact, i. 299.
Therapeutae, i. 31.
Theresa, St., ii. 232.
Theutberga, i. 276.
Thiers, ii. 368 sq.
Thiersch, ii. 421.
Thietgaut of Treves, i. 277.
Thirty Years' War, ii. 219 sq.
Thomasius, ii. 414.
Thomas, of Aquino, ii. 68, 80 sq., 129; a Becket, i. 342 sq., ii. 196; à Kempis, ii. 65, 87; Moore, ii. 351; of Strasburg, ii. 86; of Villanova, ii. 232.
Thomas, St., Christians, i. 181.
Thomassin, ii. 257 sq.
Thomists, ii. 82, 125.
Thontrakians, i. 172.
Thorney Abbey, i. 278.
Thorn, Religious Conference ii. 268.
Thrasamund, i. 220.
Three chapters, i. 188.
Thuringia, i. 234 sq.
Thyestic repasts, i. 58
Tiara, ii. 51.
Tiberius, i. 54.
Tillemont, i. 22.
Tilly, ii. 221.
Timotheus Ælurus, i. 184.
Tindal, ii. 293.
Tipasa, miracle, i. 220.
Tiridates, i. 118.
Tithe Bill, ii. 391.
Tithes, i. 270.
Titian, ii. 123 sq.
Titular bishops, i. 272; ii. 55.
Titus, i. 48, 55.
Tobias of York, i. 230.
Toland, ii. 293.
Toledo, Synods, i. 172, 220.
Toleration Edict of Joseph (II.), ii. 219, 252.
Toletus, Francis, ii. 257.
Tomacelli, ii. 25.
Tonsure, i. 214, 231.
Torgau, Articles, ii. 166; Treaty, ii. 165.
Torquato Tasso, ii. 309.
Torquemada, ii. 105.
Tostatus, Alphonsus, ii. 88.
Tournon, ii. 136.
Tours, Cloister-school, i. 287.
Tractarians, ii. 396 sq.
Tradition, i. 99 sq.
Traditionalism, ii. 409.
Traditors, i. 59.
Traducianism, i. 88.
Trajan, Emperor, i. 48, 55.
Translations of the Bible, ii. 130.
Transubstantiation, ii. 119.
Trappists, ii. 240.
Traversari, ii. 94, 97.
Treillard, ii. 335.
Trent, Council, ii. 175, 226 sqq.
Treuga Dei, i. 310.
Treves, pilgrimage to, ii. 356, 424.
Tribur, Assembly of Princes, i. 325; Reformatory Synod, i. 280.
Tridentine profession of faith, ii. 230.
Trinitarians, i. 162 sq.; order, ii 64.
Trinity, feast, ii. 125.
Tritheism, i. 186.
Trithemius, John, ii. 92.
Triumphus, Augustus, ii. 18.
Trivium, i. 287.
Troy, Synod, i. 276.
Trudpert, St., i. 232.
Trullan Synod, i. 135, 138; (II.), i. 194.
Trygvesen, Olaf, i. 242.
Trypho, Dialogue, i. 83.
Tubirius of Lima, ii. 148.
Tudeschi, ii. 37, 89.
Tudun, i. 289.
Turketul, Abbey, i. 278.

Digitized by Google

Turrecremata, ii. 90, 94.
Turretin, i. 25.
Tutilo, i. 288.
Typus of Constans (II.), i. 193.
Tyrants, murder of, ii. 237.
Tyre, Synod, i. 165.

UBAGHS, ii. 409.
Ubertino of Casale, ii. 18.
Ubiquity, ii. 266.
Uchanski, ii. 216.
Uda, i. 232.
Udoceus, St., i. 227.
Uhlich, ii. 417.
Ulfilas, i. 219.
Ulric, of Augsburg, i. 280, 307; Hutten, ii. 92; of Würtemberg, ii. 169.
Unam sanctam, Bull, i. 365.
Uniformity, Act of, ii. 198.
Unigenitus, Bull, ii. 281.
Union, attempts at, between Catholics and Greeks, ii. 93 sq.; between Catholics and Protestants, ii. 286 sq.; among Protestants, ii. 286 sq., 415 sq.
Union, decree at Florence, ii. 97.
Unitarians, ii. 262, 276.
Universal German Library, ii. 299.
Universities, ii. 73 sq.
Unni, i. 241.
Upsala, i. 241; Disputation, ii. 213; so-called Council, ii. 214.
Urban (I.), i. 79; (II.), i. 330, 341; (III.), i. 344; (V.), ii. 22; (VI.), ii. 23 sq., 107; (VIII.), ii. 243, 279.
Ursacius of Singidunum, i. 166.
Ursinus (Ursicius), i. 143, 162.
Ursuline Nuns, ii. 239.
Usuard, i. 307.
Utah Territory, ii. 421.
Utraquists, ii. 114.
Utrecht, metropolis, ii. 384; Schism, ii. 283; Union, ii. 194.

VALENCE, Synod, i. 178, 302.
Valens, Emperor, i. 123; Bp. of Mursa, i. 166.
Valentine, Gnostic, i. 92; Pope, i. 255.
Valentinian (I.), i. 123; (II.), i. 123, 171; (III.), i. 179, 182.
Valerian, Emperor, i. 58.
Valerius, Bp. of Hippo, i. 158.
Valesius, i. 25.
Valla, L., ii. 91.
Valladolid, ii. 72.
Vallombrosa, i. 282, 284.
Vandals, i. 220.
Vannes, Congregation, ii. 240.
Varlet, Dominic, ii. 284.
Vasquez, ii. 257, 278.
Vassy, ii. 186.
Vatican Council, ii. 405 sq.
Veccus, ii. 94.
Vechta, Conrad, ii. 114.
Vega, Lope de, ii. 309.
Venantius Fortunatus, i. 207.
Venema, i. 25.
Venice, Peace, i. 339; struggle with Rome, ii. 243.
Verbiest, ii. 138.
Vercelli, Synod, i. 304.
Verona, Council, ii. 104.
Veronica, image, i. 210.
Vespasian, Emperor, i. 48, 55.
Vicari, Archbishop, ii. 362 sq.
Vicarius, Christi, ii. 51; generalis, ii. 55; perpetuus, ii. 56.
Vicelin, i. 318.
Victor, Pope (I.), i. 76, 79, 113; (II.), i. 265, 281; (III.), i. 330; (IV.), i. 334.
Victor, Emmanuel, ii. 374 sq., 402 sq.
Victorinus, i. 51.
Vienna, Concordat, ii. 39; Congress, ii. 343.
Vienne, Synod, i. 331; ii. 14.
Vieyra, ii. 144, 259.
Vigilantius, i. 212.
Vigilius, Pope, i. 147, 185, 189 sq.
Vigils, i. 114.
Vilmar, ii. 414.
Vincent, of Beauvais, ii. 83; of Capua, i. 166; Ferrer, ii. 26, 29.
Vinci, Leonardo da, ii. 123.
Vinea, Peter de, i. 351.
Vintimilla, ii. 282.
Viollet-le-Duc, ii. 427.
Viret, ii. 178.
Virgilius, Bp. of Salzburg, i. 243.
Virginity, i. 115.
Vischer, ii. 124.
Visigoths, i. 218 sq.
Visitation, Order of the, ii. 239.
Visitations of bishops, i. 136; ii. 229.
Vita canonica or communis, i. 272.
Vitalian, i. 148, 185, 193.
Vitus, i. 320.
Vivarium, i. 222.
Vivès, L., ii. 93.
Volmar, Melchior, ii. 182.
Voltaire, ii. 295.
Vulgate, revised, ii. 242.

WALAFRIED Strabo, i. 288.
Walburgis, St., i. 236.
Waldeck, Francis, ii. 171.
Waldemar of Denmark, i. 318.
Waldenses, ii. 99 sq.
Waldrada, i. 277.
Wallenstein, ii. 221.
Walter, of St. Victor, ii. 84; von der Vogelweide, ii. 130.
Wamba, i. 220.
Wandelbert, i. 307.
Ward, Mary, ii. 239.
Warham, ii. 195.
Warnefried, i. 286.
Warsaw, Religious Peace, ii 216.
Warwick, ii. 197.
Wasa, Gustavus, ii. 213.
Watson, Thomas, ii. 200.
Watteville, ii. 271.
Wazon, i. 290.
Weigel, ii. 270.
Weishaupt, i. 302.
Weislinger, ii. 286.
Weismann, i. 24.
Wellesley, ii. 395.
Wellington, ii. 390.
Wenceslaus of Bohemia, ii 111 sq.
Wenceslaw, i. 243.
Werkmeister, ii. 302.
Werner, Zachary, ii. 354.
Wertheim Bible, ii. 300.
Wesel, John of, ii. 132.
Wesley, John and Charles ii. 272 sq.
Wessel, John, ii. 132.
Wessenberg, ii. 343 sq.
Wessex, i. 229.
Westminster Abbey, i. 278.
Westphalia, Peace, ii. 222.
White, ii. 149.
Whitefield, George, ii. 272.
Whitfield, ii. 315.
Wibald, i. 325.
Wiching, Bishop, i. 243.
Wicho, Bishop, i. 239.
Widukind, i. 289.
Wieland, ii. 298.
Wigand, ii. 266.
Wigbert, i. 233.
Wilberforce, ii. 398.
Wild, J., ii. 259.
Wilfried, Bishop, i. 229, 233, 239.
Wilhelmina of Bohemia, ii. 99.
Willehad, B., i. 239.
William, of Bavaria (IV.), ii. 233; the Blest, i. 284; of Champeaux, ii. 77; of England (I.), i. 281, 324; (II.), i. 340 sq.; of Occam, ii. 18, 85, 170; of Orange, ii. 192 sq., 380; of Paris, ii. 99; du Plessis, i. 363, ii. 14; of Prussia, ii. 360; of Thierry, ii. 78, 86.

Digitized by Google

Willibald, i. 236.
Willibrord, i. 239.
Wimmer, Boniface, ii. 320.
Wimpheling, ii. 132.
Wimpina, Conrad, ii. 156.
Windesheim, Canons regular, ii. 65.
Windischmann, ii. 362.
Winfried, i. 233.
Winno, i. 319.
Wiseman, ii. 397 sq.
Wittekind, i. 237.
Wittenberg, Concordia, ii. 169.
Wittiza, i. 220.
Witzel (Wicel), ii. 220.
Wlademir, i. 246.
Wladislaw (IV.), ii. 216.
Woellner, Prussian Minister, ii. 299.
Wolf, i. 23; ii. 297.
Wolfgang, Bp. of Ratisbon, i. 246.
Wolsey, ii. 194.
Woolston, ii. 293.
Worms, Concordat, i. 332; Diet, ii. 159.
Worship, i. 114, 199; ii. 307.
Wouters, i. 22.
Wratislaw, i. 243.
Wrede, ii. 346.
Wulfram, Bishop, i. 233, 239.
Wunibald, i. 236.
Würzburg, Assembly, ii. 356.
Wyatt, ii. 198.
Wycliffe, ii. 107.

XAVIER, St. Francis, ii. 135.
Xenaias, i. 185.
Ximenes, Cardinal, i. 200, 321; ii. 88, 142.

YORK, Bishopric, i. 228.
Young, Brigham, ii. 421.
Yxkuell, i. 318.

ZACCARIA, ii. 250.
Zachary, Pope, i. 236, 251.
Zachary, of Anagni, i. 296.
Zapolya, ii. 217.
Zelus domus Dei, Bull, ii. 222.
Zeno, Emperor, i. 181, 184 sq.
Zenobia, i. 96.
Zephyrinus, Pope, i. 75, 79, 87, 109.
Zinzendorf, ii. 271, 290.
Ziska, ii. 115.
Zoglio, ii. 254.
Zosimus, Pagan, i. 125; Pope, i. 144, 175 sq.
Zülpich (Tolbiacum), battle, i. 223.
Zurich, Zwinglianism, ii. 176 sqq.
Zwickau, Prophets, ii. 160, 192.
Zwinglius, ii. 176 sq., 209 sq.

Digitized by Google